THE BERKELEY CRISIS: A CASE STUDY OF PROTESTANT CAMPUS MINISTERS

by

Elden Eugene Jacobson

A Dissertation
Presented to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Yale University in
Candidacy for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

1966

ABSTRACT

This is a study of the relationship between Christian faith and act. As such, it focuses upon six Protestant campus ministers at the University of California, Berkeley, during the 1964-65 academic year as they responded to and participated in the "Free Speech" crisis. It seeks to describe what these men did, what they thought and said, and the aspects of Christian faith, as well as the situational factors, which may account for that action. From this study emerge several crucial considerations for the understanding of "role" in the campus ministry, and for the possibility of its future institutionalization.

Procedures. The University of California was selected primarily because it has been the locus for an event unprecedented in American higher education; it was assumed that in crisis settings, rather fundamental facets of action become more apparent as basic values and commitments are called into question. A three-fold typology was constructed, each category containing two ministers: reactive--those who refused to support the Free Speech Movement; middle-range--those who offered selective support; supportive--those who provided considerable support. Each man was studied in relation to his situational factors and his value-orientation (Parsons and Kluckhohn). Varying interpretations of the classic Christian tenets of proclamation, reconciliation, and a prophetic sense of community were assumed to reveal, through semi-structured interviews, analysis of materials written by each man during the crisis, and interviews with local clergy and university officials, the value-orientations of these six men. This data was utilized to explicate and interpret the diverse action observed. It was also assumed that differing interpretations of these classic themes would corrolate with differing self-conceptions of their role as Christian ministers in higher education.

Conclusions. Each of the above assumptions was confirmed. Campus ministers were found to have played a part of some importance in the crisis events. Numerous variables were found to cluster around each typological category, analytically delineating each from the others with marked specificity. Situational factors were judged to be of importance, but not generally determinative. Crucial are value-orientations, the understanding of basic religious tenets. The two men in each typological category share numerous fundamental interpretations not only of the crisis but of the church and university. It is concluded that religious belief does significantly influence the positions they adopted, and their conceptions of role. It also has considerable import for the possibility of a professionalized, institutionalized campus ministry.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I. INTRODUCTION: PURPOSES AND DESIGN 1

II. THE BERKELEY PROTESTANT MINISTRY: BEFORE 35

III. THE BERKELEY PROTESTANT MINISTRY: CONTINUED 81

IV. DAYS OF CRISIS 108

V. THE BERKELEY PROTESTANT MINISTRY: AFTER 155

VI. THE BERKELEY PROTESTANT MINISTRY: CONCLUDED 204

VII. WHAT IT MAY MEAN 229

BIBLIOGRAPHY 262

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: PURPOSES AND DESIGN

There is in a growing body of religious and social writing the common assumption that many aspects of the Christian faith and its practices have been outmoded in a technological, secular world.[1] The debate has engaged many elements within Protestantism including, notably, that aspect of the professional clergy which has particular responsibility to serve those within the academic community. Stressing selected theological or social themes which are presumed basic to some desired and hoped-for action, much of this current literature seeks new doctrinal emphases and/or organizational structures which will, it is said, permit a "new openness to the world" or a "reconciliation within the fractured university." Long upon prescription, although frequently vague in demonstrating recognizable connections between what men believe and what they do, much of the debate appears to involve assumptions about the reality and viability of Christian ministries generally, and campus ministries particularly, which may have minimal grounding in fact.

These generalities provide for this inquiry what Merton and Lazarsfeld have termed the "originating observation," an apprehension that a problem exists.[2] This study is concerned with the campus ministry as a focus on the relational problem of Christian faith and act. More specifically, it involves six Protestant campus ministers at the University of California, Berkeley, during the 1964-65 academic year as they respond to and participate in the Free Speech crisis. It seeks to:

---

[1] See, e.g., Harvey Cox, The Secular City; Gibson Winter, The Suburban Captivity of the Churches; Peter Berger, The Noise of Solemn Assemblies; Pike, A Time for Christian Candor; Colin W. Williams, What in the World; D. L. Mundy, The Idea of a Secular Society; Joseph Fletcher, Situation Ethics.

[2] See Robert K. Merton, "Problem-Finding in Sociology," Sociology Today, edited by Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom, and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., pp. xiii-xix. Also, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, "Problems in Methodology," ibid., p. 48.

1. Describe what each of these six men did.

2. Probe what they thought and said, the aspects of Christian faith, as well as situational factors, which may account for that action.

3. Describe the "styles" of ministry present in these six ministers and to critically examine, in the light of this study, certain assumptions present in much of the current literature concerning the campus ministry.

To expand on each of these three points:

Point one: The importance of California's student revolt is difficult to overestimate. As Edward D. Eddy, President of Chatham College, recently insisted, this crisis "saved the American college for the student.... Without Berkeley, the American college student would have found himself an extension, rather than the core, of the educational machine."[3] Certain of the campus ministers at that university performed important roles for the Free Speech Movement, the faculty, and the administration throughout that controversy not generally recognized in other accounts of these events and this study records that fact.

Point Two: The problem is real. As Kenneth Underwood has noted, for example, models of moral action forthcoming from both university and church have frequently demonstrated an embarrassing inadequacy as men have sought to find in them significant insight into their own moral reasoning and acting.[4] On the one hand, scholasticism, "in which rules for any and every situation could be found in the relevant manual,"[5] clearly fails to account presently, if ever, for Catholic ethical practice.[6] Models which counter such positions by centrally placing "radical obedience" in a contextual frame where decision and act must be left "to the man in his concrete situation," where "if a man really loves, he knows already what he has to do,"[7] also provide minimal help in illumining processes through which ethical choices are made. Models have usefulness to the extent they provide patterns for describing and understanding actuality, what is in fact the case, and one supposes that between the two extremes indicated exists an analytical construct more in keeping with reality. Though it will certainly remain cognizant of the unique character each new context presents to those who act within it, also present must be the continuities of past experience, both sociological and psychological, which mark us as individuals and groups, the aspects of valuations, motives, ends, consequences, which seem present in the choosing process. To again cite Underwood:

---

[3] Quoted in The New Haven Register, Feb. 11, 1966, p. 2.

[4] Kenneth W. Underwood, The Campus Ministries and the Ethical Question of the University, p. 11.

> One of the conclusions I have reached is that we are in grave need of knowledge, not so much of how we think people in various positions of responsibility ought to act, and what they ought to bring to their actions in the way of religious principles, but of knowledge that tells us the actual basis or grounds of action of men in the major institutions and professions of the society.[8]

Talcott Parsons makes this same point:

---

[5] E. J. Egan, Ethics and the Campus Ministry, p. 4.

[6] Lenski's Detroit study indicates that approximately 40% of those Catholics in the survey's sample found birth control acceptable. Even if one assumes that the remaining 60% who state an objection also do not use birth control methods, almost half of the sample's Catholics were admitting to a dichotomy between accepted Catholic ethical dogma and their own individual behavior. See Gerhard Lenski, The Religious Factor, pp. 148-51.

[7] Rudolph Bultmann, Jesus and the Word, p. 94.

[8] Underwood, op. cit., pp. 13-14.

> Hence the problem of the role of ideas cannot be treated adequately in terms of ad hoc recitation of the facts of certain examples. It involves systematic theoretical analysis of action, of the relation of the same variables to many different concrete situations.[9]

This study does not presume to create new models. But it may produce knowledge of the type Underwood and Parsons call for as the various components of faith are seen at work in particular actors.

Point three: Consider the following paragraph from Harvey Cox's The Secular City, a recent book frequently cited as useful for understanding religion in the university.

> It is clear that any work which is not radically ecumenical has no place on the university campus, or indeed anywhere else. It is clear that Christians in the university of tomorrow will live in serious openness to the university itself and to the world the university is shaping. It is also clear that the gathered stage of this church's life will occur in small, disciplined groups constituted on a functional basis. The clearest thing of all is that the future shape of the church in the university will occur only when Christians live with responsibility within it and for it, and not in and for the denominational churches that have only succeeded in weakening and fragmenting the university's life.[10]

Numerous assertions are present in this statement, each of which is open to reasonable doubt. For example:

1. All religious endeavors within the university must be "radically ecumenical." If this terminology is taken at face value, denominational identification must be abandoned as a precondition to any meaningful religious encounter between Christians and university. Even if necessity be shown (it is not), practical considerations certainly question the possibility of implementation. "The dream of organic Christian union on campuses," writes Parker Rossman, "lies far off in the distant future...,"[11]

---

[9] Talcott Parsons, Essays in Sociological Theory, p. 31.

[10] Harvey Cox, op. cit., p. 236.

[11] Parker Rossman, "Perspectives on Christian Unity," in The Challenge of Christian Unity, ed. by W. B. Blakemore, p. 142.

a judgment offered from several years' study of campus religious groups. If Cox is correct in his vision, he may well be irrelevant. Whether all "work" must be "radically ecumenical," however, would seem as much a question of investigation as assertion.

2. All Christians must address themselves to the university in "serious openness." This insistence presupposes radical ecumenicity and fails to consider numerous religious groups which, by virtue of tradition and doctrine, place minimal emphasis upon the structural arrangements men create, including the university. A problem would seem to be present when such groups are defined away in lieu of considerations which take into account the order, support and rationale received by individuals identified with them.

3. The church's "gathered" life will occur in small, disciplined groups based on "function." Cox employs the term "gathered" to denote Christian cultic acts of worship and study. How these groups are related organizationally with other "gathered" groups or churches (meaning denominational congregations), Cox does not say; questions of religious leadership, of cultic expressions like preaching and the administering of sacraments, of nurture and religious education, are minimized or ignored. Likewise, "function" suggests a unity of interest which may be more apparent than actual. Clark Kerr has indicated that "the university is so many things to so many people that it must, of necessity, be partially at war with itself."[12] Because the university is not a functionally uniform entity--students, faculty and administration clearly do not define their essential "function" in identical terms--one must ask, what function? And having defined function within the university, how does this relate to

---

[12] Clark Kerr, The Uses of the University, p. 8.

other functions inherent in the social roles of father, wage earner, scholar, academic politician, etc., which Christians in the university also play out? If an initial impression of Cox's intent is correct, these "functional" groups become narrow, self-contained entities based upon interests of limited scope not consonant with the "serious openness" and "radical ecumenicity" called for above.

4. Denominational activity has weakened and fragmented the "university's life." Several interpretations of this sentence are possible, in a declining order of probability. Churches have drawn students and faculty away from their primary concern for life within the university community; or, activity by churches has resulted in universities whose conception of unity and purpose has degenerated in reference to some indeterminate point in past history; or, churches must share blame for the current fragmentation and compartmentalized nature of the university's discipline-oriented structure. Whatever Cox wishes to suggest, each of these requires careful definition of "activity," of "university life," and of indicators by which "weakened" and "fragmented" can be measured. It might be added that each of these possibilities supposes a denominational religious influence which few observers have been able to detect within most university communities.[13]

Cox may, of course, be quite correct in each of the above assertions. Only study and examination in particular situations can, however, provide the bridge from assertion to fact.[14]

---

[13] This does not deny the historical and contemporary influence wielded in the several hundred colleges still controlled by or affiliated with denominational bodies. The context of Cox's statement implies the large, often public, university, with its very different situation.

[14] An additional problem is also present in Cox's writing, which is simply noted here. Using the future indicative--"will live...," "will occur...," etc.--he has sought to convey future certainty; they are statements of what will be. In actuality, this cloaks the prescriptive nature,

These are crucial problems for the churches and their campus ministries.[15] In a long and varied history antedating 1900, Protestant denominations have invested considerable resources, both financial and human, in the shaping of a religious presence in or near this country's large universities.[16] Involving approximately two hundred university pastors in 1938, this figure increased to eight hundred in 1955,[17] and has by most current estimates doubled during the past ten years. The value of physical facilities--foundation centers, student living units, ministerial housing, etc.--and salaries now totals many millions of dollars. With the majority of such men located in state college and university settings, no comparable group exists through which the churches' oft-stated desire for conversation with and service to the larger society might be voiced.[18] It is commonplace to observe that our large universities occupy highly complex and interrelated positions in the discovery and utilization of knowledge, knowledge with which the engines of unprecedented social change and development have been fueled, and one would suppose the campus ministry to be deeply

---

the "ought," which Cox really intends. However much he may hope certain events will come to pass, no evidence here presented warrants the casting of that hope in forms connoting certainty, when the optative is called for.

[15] "Campus ministry" may be viewed as a much more inclusive term than "campus minister," embracing not only the work of clergy but ministries which laity--faculty, students, administrators, etc.--perform in the university context. For purposes of this study, however, campus "minister" and "ministry" are used synonymously, defined as seminary-trained men (and women) who understand the university, or certain individuals within it, as the primary focus of their work. "Campus pastors" and "campus religious workers" are also used as synonyms.

[16] For a full account of this history, see Clarence P. Shedd, The Church Follows its Students.

[17] Clarence P. Shedd, "Religion in Higher Education: Retrospect and Prospect," The Christian Scholar, Dec., 1955, p. 275.

[18] Ibid.

involved in the understanding and interpretation of this explosion of knowledge, both to their immediate student constituencies and to those churches whose support makes possible such ministries. Too, campus ministries would seem vitally situated as students grapple with ethical, moral dilemmas inherent in the relational question which asks the relevance of the classroom for the wider world "out there."

Yet in spite of these seemingly crucial considerations, signs of retrenchment in the campus ministry are now evident, and many of its critics believe it has no place within the university, that it ought to quietly disband. The validity of such charges, and the analyses which lead to them, has been difficult to evaluate because the very numbers and diversity of present campus religious patterns preclude accurate generalization. They have been, characteristically, impressionistic portraits, glossing over or blotting out the particularity of individual contexts, and one suspects that, in Merton's interesting phrase, "explanations are provided for things that never were." The simple truth appears to be that systematic knowledge of this ministry as it confronts higher education and seeks to more adequately conceptualize its roles, purposes, and relationships in and with the university world is presently not available.

This fact helps account for the Danforth Foundation's decision to conduct a study of the professional campus minister which in its breadth of coverage and depth of analysis significantly supercedes all previous efforts. Designed to place this ministry in the wider context of both church and university, interested in exploring every facet of these institutions which impinge upon campus pastors as they shape a professional self-definition, this study brings together a variety of disciplines and methodological research procedures--extensive surveys, numerous case studies, etc. Three years in its formulation and execution, this far-reaching research effort promises to "present rich and complex ways of understanding what is happening in the relations of church, college and the larger culture."[19] This dissertation, partially funded by the Danforth Study, is one aspect of this much larger mosaic.

The Methodology

There are, of course, numerous conceptual and methodological tools available in modern sociological research, each of which, depending upon objective and intended result, facilitates the formulation of a problem and the collection of data assumed necessary for its solution. This is a "qualitative case study," to borrow Allen Barton's phrase,[20] and differs from quantitative studies in that "quantitative" usually involves analytic categories to which numerical values may be assigned and statistical tests of probability and significance computed. "Qualitative" suggests questions of more or less, and is more dependent upon the observer's ability to discern and distill what is important from large amounts of factual material which, perhaps, are not.[21] The emphasis is intensive rather than extensive. Case studies have the additional advantage of establishing, over time, whatever correlations may or may not exist between verbal behavior, what people say, and non-verbal behavior, what they in fact do.[22] The objective has been a study of "what individuals and groups of individuals in specific, manageable, institutional contexts can themselves do in response to events affecting them and their work."[23]

---

[19] "Danforth Study of Campus Ministries," Pamphlet issued by The Danforth Foundation.

[20] Allan H. Barton, The College as a Social Organization, p. 4.

[21] See Bernard Berelson, Content Analysis in Communications Research.

[22] This minimizes what John F. Scott calls "the sterility of relying solely on verbal profession of value without systematically relating it to non-verbal behavior." "Book Reviews," American Sociological Review, Dec., 1965, p. 971.

Having determined the type of study, data may be collected in several says. Blau indicates three useful methods, each of which lends itself admirably to the "qualitative case study" I have indicated.[24]

1. Watching people. While least important, this aspect is appealed to at several points. Observing the actors in this study as they appeared before various groups, noting the general mode of presentation, audience reaction, etc.--these provide useful clues.

2. Analysis of documents. Though the quantity authored by each man differs widely, each (with one exception discussed below) has had recourse to written argument, statement and exposition, using such means for clarifying those factors seen as crucial to understanding the strange sequence of unexpected events. Here are found eloquent description, empassioned pleas for moderation and justice, etc., offering considerable insight into what is perceived and why. Additionally, campus ministers in concert issued a number of statements speaking to particular issues, each calculated to achieve the widest possible circulation for collective decisions arrived at. These statements, and the interesting machinations behind their preparation and approval, provide highly relevant data. Enormous quantities of material appeared during the period following these events as spokesmen for every possible persuasion sought to analyze this "extremely complex and generally confusing crisis," and they, too, have been appealed to for fleshing out the larger context within which the individuals who make up

---

[23] Kenneth W. Underwood, unpublished report to the Danforth Foundation.

[24] Peter Blau, Formal Organizations, p. 16.

this study acted.[25]

3. Asking questions. The recorded interview has been, without doubt, the single most important tool utilized. Each respondent saw fit to discuss at length the series of questions posed to him; no interview's duration was less than ninety minutes, although degrees of enthusiasm were fairly apparent. Four of the sample's participants were either interested or courteous enough to spend several hours in conversation, nearly all of which was recorded and transposed into verbatum transcripts. The form is semi-structured; that is, a series of basic questions was posed to each respondent, thus preserving continuity throughout the study, while at the same time considerable freedom was retained in the matter of pursuing particular or unique issues and questions which arose within any given session. As sociologist Francois Isambert suggests:

> ...I think it is important to accord in our inquiries a considerable importance to non-structural methods, to let, particularly in the non-directed or semi-directed interview, the interrogated bring out their own words, rather than those which the sociology of religion has established, which is the result of their personal reflection.[26]

---

[25] While an exhaustive list of such accounts serves no useful purpose here, the following seem particularly useful for pursuing the multitude of issues lying beyond this study. Both Revolution at Berkeley, ed. by Michael V. Miller and Susan Gilmore, and The Berkeley Student Revolt, ed. by Seymour M. Lipset and Sheldon S. Wolin, bring together numerous and disparate materials into books which at least attempt multi-partisan representation. Hal Draper's Berkeley: The New Student Revolt, is unabashedly pro-FSM, a position Mr. Draper bravely insists (not without justification) an "objective" view of the situation demands. He has likewise sought to convey "something of the inner 'feel' and flavor of the students' movement" which by definition casts the university's administration in the worst possible light, a task at which Draper excels. See also Calvin Trillin's rambling, impressionistic account through which individual participants come alive in stirring fashion; "Letter from Berkeley," The New Yorker, March 13, 1965, pp. 52-107. An excellent chronology of events, tracing the controversy from Sept. 10, 1964, to Jan. 5, 1965, will be found in California Monthly, Feb., 1965; also included are "all important documents, reports, statements and resolutions...." What may appear in print tomorrow, or the day following, is anyone's guess.

[26] From Sociology and Religion, Proceedings of the Hazen International Conference on the Sociology of Religion, 1962, p. 19.

It is these subjective perceptions which have been sought in this study.

Any one of several large universities could have provided the setting for an inquiry into the campus ministry and the manner in which elements of faith shape and inform the types of actors in this profession. The University of California was selected because it satisfied the following criteria:

1. Size. With approximately 27,500 students enrolled during the 1964-65 academic year at some level of study, the Berkeley campus ranks as one of the largest in the United States.[27]

2. State institution. Evidence increasingly suggests that the major Protestant denominations have invested the bulk of available resources, in terms of property, buildings, and the quality of men called to them, at the state university level. Clarence Shedd observed in 1955 that "the greatest concentration of professional leadership--Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish --is to be found in the state colleges and universities,"[28] and this impression has been sustained by recent studies.[29] I have assumed that such a setting thus provides access to a sophisticated, innovative, carefully articulated ministry, to the degree it is evident anywhere. There are many variations existing in the relational patterns between state universities and religious ministries, and a situation was sought in which campus ministers actively desired a voice in academic affairs and dialogue with those inside the university community. In the terms used by Glenn A. Olds, "although it may be on the edge of the university, it seeks to work in its

---

[27] "A Season of Discontent," California Monthly, p. 6.

[28] Shedd, Scholar, p. 275.

[29] See Philip Hammond's forthcoming study, Clergy on Campus.

midst."[30] At the same time, again following widely observed patterns, only minimal recognition is given to this interest by the institution involved; California at Berkeley seemed to satisfy this dimension and is probably typical of many state institutions. Rossman, for example, finds "there is little evidence of adequate attention being given by the universities to questions of policy in this area of involvement of religion ('campus religious work') in tax-supported higher education."[31] One thus postulates that tensions in the definition of oneself as essentially university-oriented would very likely be present.

3. Wide range of religious expression. There were, in 1964-65, somewhat more than thirty individuals who indicate the campus as an essential part of their ministry. More than half of this number define themselves as campus religious workers whose primary, often sole, ministerial responsibility is toward the university or some aspect of it. This large group contains, one would assume, widely varying conceptions of the minister's task or role on campus.

4. A base of institutional support for the inquiry. Pacific School of Religion, located immediately adjacent to the Berkeley campus, was already the locus for a collegium rethinking and redefining the concept of student religious commitment within the context of the Danforth Study of Campus Ministries, and numerous problems associated with data collection were seen to be minimized through contact with and support from this group.

---

[30] Glenn A. Olds, "Religious Centers," in Religion and the State University, ed. by Erich A. Walter, p. 237. Olds here discusses a typology embracing seven possible relationships between religious foundations and state universities, ranging, as one would predict, from isolation to a position which is "integral and central."

[31] Parker Rossman, "The Denominational Chaplain in the State University," Religious Education, May-June, 1960, p. 174.

5. Crisis and conflict. The deliberate choice of an institution racked by severe internal conflict, that is, the Free Speech controversy, implies at least one crucial assumption; namely, that in crisis settings, rather fundamental and important facets of the ways people relate to one another become more apparent, that the easy superficiality often attending human cooperation becomes untenable when basic values and commitments are called into question. Underwood suggests that in such action and reaction, "beliefs are tested and more adequately understood; positions are clarified and reconstituted; power drives are reinforced, checked and molded; differences and common concerns are discovered."[32] This assumption is, I believe, sustained in the remainder of this dissertation. I have further assumed that the events surrounding the Free Speech Movement were of such enormity that no one could stand aloof from them, that everyone even remotely connected with or concerned about the university community had to make choices and discriminations among the various and competing viewpoints possible. Even a decision to remain apart from the crisis would itself have to flow from a value judgment or commitment involving fundamental dispositions about the self and its relation to societal institutions. I think this assumption has also been sustained below.

"Crisis" likewise puts organizational structures and arrangements "to the test," providing data which illumines the effectiveness of student and professional groups campus ministers have established. Do these groups achieve stated objectives, do they respond flexibly and creatively as new, even unprecedented events occur? How is the crisis understood in terms of rethinking such organizations? Do the themes of "depersonalization," "free speech," "social relevance," and "knowledge factory," so much in evidence throughout the crisis, suggest new and important nuances for the shaping of one's ministry to students who embrace such themes as real and descriptive? Such rethinking, we assume, becomes manifest in reflections upon not only one's understanding of role and ministry, but, as actor, the forms through which such reflections are implemented--programming, allocation of personnel in terms of increasing specialization, revised financial arrangements, etc. One further point is of significance here. Campus ministries owe their very existence to the churches' assumption that institutions of higher education constitute a unique and particular environment which cannot, usually, be adequately served through the residential parish churches adjacent to it. Since this environment provides their very reason-for-being, the degree to which campus religious workers understand it, and the constituent parts which make it up, would seem crucial. For example, Nevitt Sanford argues that "our colleges," in cooperation with major forces in society, and through poor organization and teachers, have "actually deprived thousands of students of the opportunity to find themselves and to educate themselves."[33] Assuming the truth of this indictment, what is its meaning for a campus ministry? What images do campus ministers hold regarding higher education? How does the campus minister "read" his student clientele? The events at California brought such issues and questions into sharp focus.

---

[32] Kenneth W. Underwood, Protestant and Catholic, p. 378.

Having made the choice of location, three trips were made to the West Coast, the first in March, 1965, the second in May, the third in August; these might be designated, respectively: exploratory, data-gathering, and follow-up. With a combined aggregate of nearly six weeks in California, this spacing permitted contact with the study's principal figures while the crisis was still in process of resolution, as well as later discussions centering on "what did it mean?" and "where to now?"

---

[33] Nevitt Sanford, "Research and Policy in Higher Education," The American College, ed. by Nevitt Sanford, p. 1009.

The process by which the six men who make up this study were selected is simple and straightforward. As has been noted, they are Protestants, representing the largest of the denominational groupings.[34] The choice of Protestants, and the exclusion of Catholics and Jews, derives from the assumption that a recognizable common context would be evident within which comparisons and distinctions might more easily be drawn. For example, five of the six ministers in the sample are members of a formal organization composed of Protestant campus ministers; action occurring in this group provides numerous clues into the beliefs and aspirations these men bring to their ministries. Very early in the study it was apparent that some campus ministers were deeply involved in the controversy's on-going events, or, more accurately, some had committed themselves to specific forms of action which actively and openly supported important aspects of the FSM's position, which perceived certain fundamental problems to be crucial, particular goals to be attained, etc. At the same time, their colleagues adopted, in varying degrees, positions which refused to offer such support, which were highly critical of the FSM's objectives, particularly as they related to means being employed to achieve them. Between these two poles several other campus ministers constituted a "middle-range" where support for those seeking change in the university was generally present but who, in response to their own conceptions of order, or perceptions of pressure and resistance from local churches or governing boards, found full support and participation impossible or undesirable. A three-fold division thus emerges:

---

[34] The Southern Baptist ministry, although comparatively somewhat smaller in terms of student constituency, was included on other grounds.

Campus ministers at California

reactive	middle-range	supportive

By reactive, we shall mean: "a desire to return to a previous condition of affairs" (Oxford Dictionary); that is, such campus ministers openly condemned those means employed by the FSM and refused, for the most part, to intercede at any point in the crisis. By supportive, we shall mean: campus ministers who supported, generally, both tactics utilized and goals desired, and who sought roles of interpretation and mediation.

One further distinction was also readily apparent early in the study which accounted for differences between men otherwise classified together as reactive or supportive. In the language of this study, an actor's conception of "person" or "group" as a fundamental component of action is an important distinction running through all three categories. That is, some campus ministers cast their whole ministries in terms of interpersonal relationships or propositional formulations stressing the individual as an isolated, decision-making entity; only the individual receives, responds to, and invites others to share in, the faith. Others seem much more inclined to proceed on the basis of the "gathered," a collective in which the individual is sustained, in which the group's Gestalt provides a life, a meaning, a completion not possible outside itself. In this sense, group has meaning as an entity which may be said to act. While obviously not mutually exclusive, these two distinctions present differing orientations in these men as they reflect upon the rich diversity which characterizes their ministries.

The typology now has six elements:

	reactive	middle range	supportive
group			
individual			

By group, we shall mean: a conception of ministry laying emphasis upon the collective as an actor, as the component which exercises power or meaningfully relates individuals to one another. By individual, we shall mean: a conception of ministry in which men act responsively and genuinely in the context of one-to-one relationships, in which group action as a viable and imaginative form of action tends to be minimized.[35]

These are, again, divisions based upon observation and have no *initial* meaning beyond the definitions given to them above. As such they indicate or imply possible modes of response to events. The crucial questions--Why do some respond positively and some negatively to the FSM, and what are the conceptions of ministry present?--remain.

"The choice of concepts," Merton indicates, "guiding the collection and analysis of data is...crucial to empirical inquiry."[36] Concepts define what shall be observed, what has importance in illuminating and explaining a problem or phenomenon; they provide selectivity amid the profusion of "facts" or data extant in any social situation. This study is, it has been noted, a study of men who act in response to an event of considerable importance, and the concepts which give it form are those present in what

---

[35] This observation appears analogous to James Gustafson's discussion of Church as both "institution and fellowship." As he insists, "the identity of the inner life as Christian depends upon the proper functioning of the institutional forms." *Treasure in Earthen Vessels*, p. 102. Gustafson suggests that deviations emphasizing one at the other's expense may be related to doctrinal formulation and he explicitly identifies "sectarians on the left-wing" who "fell into the error of assuming the rightness of the community's understanding and action because they were presumably informed directly by the Bible...." *Ibid.* In this study, however, this tension is present across the theological spectrum.

[36] Robert Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure*, p. 90.

Parsons has called "an action frame of reference," summarized in the following paragraph.

> Reduced to the simplest possible terms, then, a social system consists in a plurality of individual actors interacting with each other in a situation which has at least a physical or environmental aspect, actors who are motivated in terms of a tendency to the 'optimization of gratification' and whose relation to their situations, including each other, is defined and mediated in terms of a system of culturally structured and shared symbols.[37]

For analytic purposes, three fundamental components may be distilled from this definition: 1) actors; 2) physical, situational factors; and 3) the systems of values by which actors relate to one another and to the situation.[38] Highly interrelated and interdependent, as the statement demonstrates, they may nevertheless be characterized and examined in terms of characteristics distinctive to each.

1. Actors. Parsons posits three elements in the "need-disposition" system of individuals: the cathectic, or immediate gratification of psychological or biological need; the cognitive, by which aspects of a situation are assessed in relation to the individual's interests; and the evaluative, through which choices are determined among the alternatives possible. Insofar as each of these personality factors has visible indices and indicators, I have understood them to properly fall within the category of values, or "value-orientations" discussed below. Where the reference is essentially psychological, having to do with fundamental personality

---

[37] Talcott Parsons, The Social System, pp. 5-6.

[38] Pitirim Sorokin has noted the importance of each component by recently observing that "recent currents of sociology...admit (directly or circuitously) three distinct components...: 1. interacting individuals...; 2. 'immaterial' meanings, values and norms...; 3. and bio-physical media in which and through which the interacting individuals 'objectify,' 'materialize,' and exchange their 'immaterial' meanings, values and norms." "Sociology of Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow," American Sociological Review, Dec., 1965, p. 839.

"types," this study remains, for the most part, silent; by design, it includes no personality survey instruments or measures and cannot handle systematically the categories of "authoritarian," "open" and "closed mindedness," etc., present in studies of greater scope. Although limitations are imposed by this inadequacy, they do not invalidate the importance of situational factors and value-orientations without which action is inexplicable. Our concern centers not in the part values and belief perform in satisfying immediate personal gratifications, but rather the part they play in resolving interpersonal and organizational issues, in the handling of tensions and the varying demands placed upon them as they act in specific and identifiable situations.

2. Situational factors. Several of these were specified in the selection of the University of California: its size, its particular pattern of church-state relations and the concomitant effect upon the campus ministry carried on there, etc. They likewise involve buildings and property; these place obvious physical limitations upon certain activities, for example, which might otherwise be deemed desirable. Buildings or foundation centers should, of course, be frequently seen as facilitators, as instruments through which goals and values are realized, and in this sense are intimately bound to value-orientations, to conceptions of ministries where their use provides a logical completion to such ministries. They must also be viewed on occasion, however, as structures of a past conception which may now bear little relationship to emerging ministerial forms and are, thus, of limited value or even disfunctional in theory and use. The factor of physical proximity to denominational churches may also determine in part the degree to which a campus pastor perceives denominational pressure for one course of action, in exclusion of another. Types of governing boards

which determine policy for denominational foundations, the individuals who characteristically serve on such boards, the method and control of their selection--these, too, exert significant influence and constitute the given in and with which campus ministers work. We are here concerned, in sum, with factors external to themselves that campus religious workers perceive as constructive enablers of given values or, conversely, limitations imposed which restrict the realization of those values. Some are common to all ministries, some are unique and non-reoccurring; their importance is considerable.

3. Values and value-orientations. With Kluckhohn, a value-orientation is understood to be "a generalized and organized conception" of nature, of God, and of social reality which defines the "meaning of life" and influences behavior for the group invoking it.[39] This "definition of the life situation" contains two conceptually-distinct types of propositions:

a. Normative. This is the realm of values, of aesthetic judgment, of the "ought," and, insofar as they imply choice, of ideals. If we take value to mean a conception "distinctive to an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means, and ends of action,"[40] the focus becomes the bases of choices observed in actors, in the reasons invoked by them to explain action taken, or to justify hoped-for direction and change in the future. Value is also, thus, evaluative, a measure of the desirable, a standard. Value implies commitment, the desirability of its attainment. Value may also imply reasonableness, although for Kluckhohn the elements of affection, of feeling, of wish, are also indispensably present. Values define limits within which impulses may be satisfied without doing violence to goals of the personality or the requirements of social congruity, and thus give stability to both personal and social life. As Kluckhohn suggests, "values add an element of predictability to social life."[41]

---

[39] Clyde Kluckhohn, "Values and Value-Orientations in the Theory of Action," in Toward a General Theory of Action, Talcott Parsons and Edward H. Shils, ed., pp. 410-11.

[40] Ibid., p. 395.

Value, because it is a logical construct (much like that of "culture") and not a directly-observable entity, must therefore be inferred from various types of action; points where approval or disapproval "is made explicit by word or deed" provides a focus for study, and includes "ought" statements, codes of law, formulations of religious dogma, etc., as well as acts which evoke strong emotional response. Secondly, one may observe degrees of effort expended in the attainment of stated ends. It is assumed that greatest effort will usually correlate with most-highly-held values. Thirdly, individuals or groups may be observed when confronted with several alternatives or choices. The selection made presumably reflects fundamental values.

b. Existential or cognitive. The use of "existential" by Kluckhohn is meant to connote "what is," propositions affirming and describing the way "things" are thought to be, an actor's orientation to "reality" as it exists independently of him.[42] Beliefs about nature, both human and divine, the beneficence (or lack thereof) each is presumed to exhibit, the nature of social organization and structure, are fundamentally questions of cognition, of what is understood to be "most real." These complex systems of belief which individuals and groups construct give order and logic to perceptions of the world they inhabit.

---

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 400.

[42] The freighted nature of the term "existential" suggests meanings not intended here, and "cognitive" will be used throughout to convey the same sense of "is" and/or "belief."

The relationship between normative and cognitive is intimate and two-way. Some beliefs, particularly as they relate to the nature of physical objects, may rightly be seen as matters-of-fact; debate concerning, for example, the composition of the moon's surface will finally be resolved independently of conflicting belief. Much belief about social reality, however, demonstrates this relationship. Thus a description of government as "over-powering" or "all-pervasive, the destroyer of privacy and initiative," may well borrow heavily from a normative "ought" position conceiving of the individual in terms of freedom from restraint. Likewise, recent statements which believe "secular man" to be an accurate account of man-as-he-is are seen to have momentous implications for the "ought" as applicable to church reorganization. With Kluckhohn, we may say that "'what is right' is of equal importance with 'what is' in defining the context of action"; indeed, as values are institutionalized and internalized, "value is part of the situation."[43]

The further concept of role seems usefully introduced at this point. Frequently utilized by sociologists and social psychologists, its use in research has not been great, largely because common agreement upon the term's constituent parts and their inter-relationships has not been achieved. If we define role, however, as "a set of expectations, or...a set of evaluative standards applied to an incumbent of a particular position," where "position" is "a location of an actor or class of actors in a system of social relationships," several aspects are evident.[44] In this social context, "relationships" suggests that roles are not objectively given, but derive relative to inter-action with counter-positions, with other actors, thus introducing the possibility of multiple sources of "expectations." For example, definition of the role concept of "father" occurs in relation to social arrangements involving children, wife, other fathers, each of whom may present to the one occupying the position of "father" sets of expectations, not all of which may be congruent. "Social relationships" also implies situational factors; definitions or standards of "father" may differ considerably between an Eskimo and an American business executive. "Expectations" further suggests both what an actor, a role incumbent, should do and what he should be, both behavior and attributes. In the example of father, such expectations might be imagined to include attributes of fairness and concern which become manifest in expected forms of behavior.

---

[43] Kluckhohn, op. cit., p. 410.

[44] Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis, p. 60.

In the sense that such impositions or expectations are placed upon an actor by social positions he perceives as having legitimate claims to do so, an actor is essentially passive, moved by demands seen emanating from others. But few roles, as noted in the above example, demonstrate complete unity of definition and expectation. Expectations flowing from any given counter position may be diffuse and ill-defined and the authority underwriting them denied. Or, although authority is acknowledged, it may be countered, modified or negated by other counter positions an actor perceives and acknowledges as primary or fundamental. In this process of selection, where questions of value and belief, where cognitive and evaluative considerations are brought to bear in the resolution of conflicting demand, authority, and pressure, an actor may be seen as active, as a mover and shaper of the role he occupies.

This use of role as a concept explicating various, often contending, sources of social pressure upon an actor, whose value-orientation provides the means of handling and resolving such pressure and expectations, seems useful in analyzing the campus ministry.[45] For such a ministry has, on the face of it, a peculiar "location." Campus religious workers are trained and supported by religious institutions, commissioned to interpret and foster a religious dimension in and for educational institutions. Given the diverse nature of these two societal structures, however, differing sets of expectations regarding the role campus ministers act out might be reasonably expected to appear and as these are perceived to be incompatible one with the other, tension and conflict would seem a logical consequence.[46]

---

[45] I do not wish to suggest a necessary sequence here; that is, pressure exists or is felt, therefore.... Clearly, prior cognative and evaluative judgments will determine in some measure the source and intensity of felt demand. A campus minister, for example, who "believes" he has no ministry or concern for the university as an institution has already foreclosed the possibility that it may legitimately impose expectations upon him, and the number of role definers or counter positions he perceives is reduced by one. Nonetheless, it is operationally helpful to think sequentially; pressures and conflicting claims do exist, and how they are resolved is our fundamental question.

[46] Philip Hamond suggests that "ambiguity" and "unacknowledgement" most adequately describe campus ministers in large state universities. As these institutions have become highly complex and "cosmopolitan," they attract ministers "theologically, politically, and economically more liberal than parish clergy," ministers "more ambivalent toward the church," whose primary orientation is "assisting higher education with its aims." Normally not officially recognized by the university, however, yet increasingly isolated from denominational support by virtue of their more "innovative" theological thought and action, these campus ministers are described as beset by uncertainty and lack of self-definition. No compensating "institutionalization" of role, no "autonomous profession" has emerged to counter this debilitating lack of recognition and legitimation, in part because such factors contribute to "lower career commitment" with a correspondingly high turnover of personnel. See Philip Hammond, "Outline of Clergy on Campus," mimeographed summary, dated April, 1965, of his forthcoming book. Are campus ministers really cognizant of a deficient role definition? This question, referred to in later chapters as the "Hammond hypothesis," was posed to each respondent in this study; replies provide insight into their self-perceptions as Christian ministers and its compatibility, or lack thereof, to the university community.

The conception receives added complexity when the analytically amorphous terms "church" and "university" are more carefully delineated. Several foci exist within the rubric of "church" from which campus ministers may derive conceptions of role, both attitudinal and behavioral: national denominational offices concerned with the campus ministry, church boards which determine financial arrangements, local pastors who may or may not sit on policy-making or corporation boards for the various local foundations, and the peer group of colleagues who share in a particular religious worker's efforts. This same diversity is apparent within the university community where, beyond the considerable variety existing between any two university settings, students, faculty and administrators frequently define themselves (and each other) in terms often pointedly at odds with the other two; likewise, definition of role and function may vary widely within any one such grouping. Campus pastors who thus conceive of ministries "to the university" have, in actuality, specified attention to groupings from which may come highly diverse, perhaps incompatible, expectations. What are the significant "counter positions" which campus ministers discern and respond to in these institutions? This question offers insight into perceptions campus ministers have of their situation and the parts played by the different components of action discussed above.

After examining our six actors in some detail, it is then possible to tentatively identify the dominant "mode of action" most characteristic of their particular ministries. As defined by Parsons and substantially modified by Underwood for use as fundamental interpretive concepts in the Danforth Campus Ministry Study, four basic modes are delineated.[47]

---

[47] See Talcott Parsons, "Pattern Variables Revisited: A Response to Robert Dubin," American Sociological Review, August, 1960, pp. 467-83; Kenneth Underwood, "Explanatory Notes on the Survey Instrument and Data in the Danforth Study of Campus Ministries," unpublished memorandum, Danforth Study of Campus Ministries, 1966.

1. Pattern maintenance. Action, both personal and to the extent possible the corporate which an actor may control, is seen to interpret and evaluate a situation and one's role in it "in terms of manipulating other persons, commitments, theories, resources so as to make them conform to the norms, laws, doctrines of the institution of which one is a leader."[48]

2. Integrative. Action is seen to be "primarily oriented toward maintaining a relationship to persons."[49] Concern is expressed for interpersonal relationships, for the support of individuals apart from their particular beliefs or their usefulness in building programs. Attention is directed to questions of identity, to the meaning of "personal authenticity," etc. "Reconciler, harmonizer, shepherd and comforter" are expressions descriptive of this ministerial role.

3. Goal-attainment. Action here centers upon the manipulation or utilization of the components within the action-field--situational factors (physical and financial resources), other actors, organizations, beliefs, etc.--for the achievement of particular goals. Such action is more inclined than the integrative to stress instrumental activity, to evaluate people in terms of "what they do, rather than what they are."[50]

4. Adaptive. This type of action "places greatest emphasis upon the adjustment of organizations, norms, persons to the changing environment and stresses the powers of rationality...to bring about the adaptation."[51] The use of specialized language and cognative systems which define some aspect of reality, emphasis upon the objectively-given nature of "things" are integral to this mode of response.

In addition, it is possible to distinguish an internal-external dimension for each of these modes; Parsons indicates that:

---

[48] Underwood, "Explanatory Notes...," p. 2.

[49] *Ibid.* [50] *Ibid.* [51] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

> In analyzing the components of any particular action system, one must also consider the larger system within which that action system is embedded. The action system is related to the 'external system' beyond it, which I refer to here as the environment of the system as distinguished from the situation of the acting unit.[52]

While we may hypothesize that the church provides this internal dimension, the "situation of the acting unit," this can only be determined empirically. With equal plausibility, the university may be discovered to be the internal, defining context within which the campus minister moves, the church and other social institutions being perceived by him as elements of the external "larger system" within which the university is "embedded." It seems reasonable to conjecture that only a ministry capable of encompassing both church and university within its internal "situation" can effectively operationalize or implement the oft-repeated purpose of a ministry to higher education, viz., conversation between the church and the academic community. The usefulness of these descriptive categories becomes more evident in Chapters Five-Seven of this study, where various consequences of particular ministerial roles are discussed.

The remaining task in this chapter is definition of value-orientation. Each minister in this study, we have noted, is Protestant. The question is one of defining with specificity the theological rubric within which Protestant faith may be understood, and the indicators which allow its examination. However it is discussed, whatever the categories employed to give it form, Christian belief has traditionally sought to explicate an understanding of God, of an ultimate reality, who both created and now sustains the physical world, who also created men and seeks relationships with them through the figure of Jesus Christ. The classical theologian Gustaf Aulén, for example, speaks of Christian belief as embracing three intimately related constituent aspects or doctrines: the conception of God as Savior, Judge, Creator, whose "inmost character" is love;[53] God's act of divine love through Jesus Christ, whereby the broken relationship of men to their Creator is healed; and a conception of the church, where the symbols of God's love and reconciliation sustain men in their confrontation with the powers of this world. These same three general themes also appear in the writings of such disparate theologians as Gustafson and his sociological analysis of the church, and Cox's exposition of Christians "finding out where the action is and the response it demands." The essential point of convergence in these and other Christians who confront the historic demands of Christian faith is the necessity to interpret, to give meaning and substance to these central tenets; they are, in fine, the bases of the Christian's value-orientation. Such orientations, it is recalled, derive from what is ultimate in the value-system of an actor, those organizing conceptions which define and interpret man and nature. For the Christian, presumably, that is God.

---

[52] Parsons, "Pattern Variables Revisited...," p. 468.

As witnesses to Christian faith, the specialized campus ministry may be understood as a manifestation of religious value-orientations within the university context, and is so understood here. For analytic purposes, three theological categories are clearly discernible in the three theologians cited above.

1. Proclamation. Embodied in this theological doctrine are fundamental postulates and feelings about the nature of God, of reality "as it really is," a sense of what is meant by the One who creates and sustains all of physical reality, who creates and sustains human life. Involved are

---

[53] Gustaf Aulén, The Faith of the Christian Church, p. 131.

images about God's nature as loving and personal, who disclosed himself through the person of Jesus Christ, the "Word made flesh." Also involved are "faith statements" regarding human nature, man's incompleteness, his fall from an original state of communion with the Creator. Proclamation thus speaks of the deepest affirmations upon which men act, that which is ultimate, which orders and sustains life. It embraces a sense of God's presence, the demands placed upon men as Divine purpose manifests itself in human history, and in the lives of men and human institutions. Additionally, it serves to define and justify for the campus ministry the meaning and purposes served by a Christian presence within the academic world, faith in the midst of learning.

2. Reconciliation. As proclamation discloses God's loving nature, men are called to share a new or restored relationship made possible by Jesus Christ. How this new "wholeness" is achieved, the meaning of Christ's life as a revelation of God's intent for men, varies considerably in Christian theological interpretation. Nonetheless, reconciliation has been fundamental in the historic insistence that men are in a state of separation, both from God and from one another, and that the fact of Christ draws men out of bondage to their own finiteness and egocentrism. For the campus ministry, reconciliation speaks of limiting, isolating structures within the university community which are frequently seen to prohibit open and direct confrontation of persons; pressures, disciplines, inflexible bureaucracies--these are aspects often believed standing in need the Christian's insistence upon the integrity and uniqueness of human personality.

3. The prophetic sense of community and fellowship. Having been drawn to God by Christ's reconciling act, the Christian orders his life in the light of this "changed situation"; demands are placed upon human activ-

ity, reflecting God's presumed presence, or aloofness from the structures and ongoing history of men. Conceptions of the "new life" may emphasize Christian withdrawal within a sinful world; it may stress visions of social orders based upon God's love, justice and equal concern for all men. A prophetic sense of community speaks of hoped-for situations in which people live in "openness" to one another, to institutional arrangements which facilitate the new state of human relationships which reconciliation brings into being. In the campus ministry, emphasis upon this sense of community frequently invokes an image or ideal where interpersonal encounter has superceded or transcended the perceived artificial character of the university's structure, or a conception of the university as an historical entity and present model which provides the basis for judgment and criticism of a misguided multi-versity.

All Christians, to the extent that religious faith provides the fundamental elements in his value-orientation, are presumed to exhibit (if only implicitly) these conceptions of God or ultimate reality, the relationship understood to exist between God and human history, and the meaning of that relation in human affairs. It has been assumed that within the value-orientations of the campus ministers in this study, as witnesses to Christian faith in the university context, these religious themes will be discernible. The basic question then focuses upon the meaning given to them by these men, and the significance they demonstrate for subsequent action.

Each category provides a conceptual image from which numerous indices derive, pointing to cognitive and normative, affective elements present. They have been utilized in this study to order and interpret the data, to set forth in much more specific fashion the variation within what might be termed a "general Protestant value-orientation."[54] To that end, the following questions were considered crucial in each of these three fundamental aspects of faith, and provide the bases by which differences between those who make up the typology are more adequately understood.

1. Proclamation.

a. What is the essential Christian message to all men?

b. Why does it require a specialized ministry to the campus? How is that message communicated to those within the academic community? Does the content or substance of faith change with one's involvement in differing specific institutional settings?

c. How is the university perceived and its character articulated? What relationships are presumed to exist between the life of faith and the life of learning, between the church and university as social institutions?

d. What is the understanding of worship and religious education in this specialized context?

2. Reconciliation.

a. The broken bonds between God and men, and men and men, which the proclamation has made manifest--how shall the Christian address himself to these?

---

[54] This is Yinger's term as he comments upon the work of Vogt and O'Dea. These two sociologists explain significantly differing developmental characteristics observed in two Southwest communities in terms of the "differences between the value-orientations central to these communities." Otherwise sharing much in common--physical environment, size, etc.--one community is "Mormon," the other "individualistic" in nature. It seems reasonable to argue that these generalized value-orientations, useful for drawing the relatively gross distinctions made by Vogt and O'Dea, can be much more sharply drawn when the sample is composed of highly articulate individuals whose life-commitment is to the religious and the particular. Evon Z. Vogt and Thomas F. O'Dea, "A Comparative Study of the Role of Values in Social Action in Two Southwestern Communities," in American Sociological Review, December, 1953, pp. 645-54. Reprinted in J. Milton Yinger, Religion, Society and the Individual, pp. 563-77.

b. In what forms does healing and reconciling come to the university as a social structure? Or those within it? (These have no necessary connection for certain types of religious formulation.)

c. What are the broken or segmented patterns within the university which require healing?

d. What meaning attaches to "whole people," "depersonalization," "authentic," etc.? What structures and mechanisms make possible the promotion of reconciliation in the academic community?

3. Prophetic sense of community.

a. Having been reconciled, what then? The concern here is to discover the ideals, the quality of life hoped for, the changes of outlook and action sought by the campus ministry among those who form their constituency and, frequently, within the university itself.

b. What are the programs of action and discussion which clarify and promote these hoped-for commitments, these ideals? What is perceived to be the most effective utilization of finances, of physical facilities, etc.?

These generalized questions lend themselves to the semi-structured form of interview discussed above, soliciting a great deal of information concerning the value-orientations of the actors involved. As is evident, they provide data which is both cognitive--perceptions or beliefs, for example, regarding the essential features of higher education; and evaluative --the hoped-for quality of "warm and humane" interpersonal relationships some campus ministers find so distressingly absent from the university scene. These three elements of faith likewise have implications for the shaping of one's role as a specialized expression of Christian ministry; for example, much of the tension and ambiguity imagined to exist where two major institutions confront the campus minister with incompatible sets of expectations is defined away if his conception of proclamation denies a relationship to the university, thus effectively negating the university's authority to impose such expectations. Thus this study seeks to describe and understand six men as moral actors, utilizing a crisis situation to illume the value-orientation embodied in each, and the relationship it has to the actions they do. In the following two chapters, these campus ministers are introduced and set into the Berkeley context as it existed prior to the crisis itself.

CHAPTER TWO

THE BERKELEY PROTESTANT MINISTRY: BEFORE

The roots of denominational activity on the collegiate scene can be traced, according to Shedd, as far back as 1887, when both Episcopalians and Presbyterians established groups at the University of Michigan;[1] this early history is also present at Berkeley. Almost from the University's founding, for example, First Congregational Church in the City of Berkeley offered programing created for California students, and the YMCA dates its establishment to 1884.[2] In the main, the developing histories of the various denominational centers suggests the usual development seen elsewhere throughout public higher education; the church attempted, in Shedd's title phrase, to follow its students. In this "home away from home" approach, student concern appears to have remained an integral part of the residential parish for several large denominations; at California, the Congregational, Methodist, and Episcopalian centers have only in recent years been given the separate and semi-autonomous status which the Presbyterian has enjoyed for many years.[3] "Student" and "home" are suggestive of much which is still present in the generalized image of religious work at Berkeley; activities and buildings being oriented almost exclusively to off-campus student concerns, conceptions of a ministry embracing the university itself have been, until very recently, almost wholly absent. This does not seem surprising in view of the minimal relationships the university has fostered, or even permitted, with the religious centers.

---

[1] Shedd, The Church Follows..., p. 11.

[2] Much of the factual material presented in this and succeeding chapters has been distilled from the taped interviews conducted with numerous individuals in Berkeley, both in and out of the denominational centers. Where such data has seemed not intimately bound to the central issues at hand, no attempt has been made to verify it through recourse to additional sources. Likewise, the sources of such material has not been identified unless the context seems to indicate necessity.

[3] Only Westminster House, the Presbyterian ministry to the campus, has a building and program not tied for many years to a local church, yet the pastoral, more traditional forms of ministry representative of the period before 1958 are evident in an unusual structural feature--the building's front door. "You pull on that door and it doesn't come. I think that's a clue to the minds of the people who built the building.... The people who

There are at least two reasons for this unacknowledgement by the California administration. First, and most frequently invoked, is the church-state issue. In education, as elsewhere, this intense, much misunderstood question may be found rationalizing a wide variety of prejudice and predisposition.[4] Article IX, Section 9, of the State of California Constitution reads in part: "The University shall be entirely independent of all political or sectarian influence and kept free therefrom...." This formulation is not, apparently, unlike that of numerous other state legal codes, and the crucial issue becomes the criteria of interpretation brought to the term "sectarian." Does "sectarian" prohibit courses in religion? Does it disallow the appearance of religious scholars? Preachers? (Where is the line of separation?) Does it foreclose the use of university facilities to campus ministers? On nearly all such issues, the Berkeley administration has been disposed toward an affirmative response;[5] an individual within the

---

built it did not anticipate it to be a public building; they thought it was a home which means the door opens in. All public buildings are required to have their doors open out...which means they really saw it as a home. The university pastor lived here...serving tea every afternoon."

[4] See, e.g., R. Freeman Butts, The American Tradition in Religion and Education; Joseph Tussman, The Supreme Court on Church and State; Leo Pfeffer, Church, State, and Freedom; Wilbur Katz, Religion and American Constitutions.

[5] The University disallowed, for example, the presentation of Rockefeller Brothers Fellowships on campus, citing the church-state principle. The decision, made at one of the lower levels within the administration of the

administration admitted that "this campus strikes me as being one of those that has been furthest out on the conservative end of the wing as far as interpretation of...separation of church and state is concerned." As this statement implies, intra-university policy varies and the issue is not clear-cut. The university's Santa Barbara campus, for example, has been developing a department of religion for several years,[6] a circumstance which an associate university dean declared in the spring of 1965 was not even a remote possibility at Berkeley.

A second element is also present, although its importance has been difficult to assess; in their less guarded moments, two university officials questioned the credentials campus ministers presumably carry; that is, why ought the administration of that vast institution take seriously the disjointed mandates flowing from religious workers? What criteria set them apart from pressures being exerted, for example, by local labor leaders? If the campus ministry wishes to function as a lobby, insisted one, clear conceptions of its constituencies are needed, at least in terms of numbers. But if that is not its intention, the argument suggests, from whence derives their authority? This attitude may be more pervasive than is commonly assumed, although its admission by those within the university's various levels and departments is not a fashionable response, and an accurate measurement of its intensity would be difficult.

Having introduced the academic context within which campus ministries developed at California, it will be useful to examine the six ministers and

---

university, could have been appealed but, the affected campus minister said, "I wasn't going to spend two or three days trying to get a room set up for this. I went to the YWCA; we held it there."

[6] See Robert Michaelson, The Study of Religion in American Universities, pp. 68-76.

ministries which provide the study's focus. Each reflects, in differing ways, the existing relationships between value-orientations and action with which they are compatible. These men were selected and categorized, it will be recalled, on the basis of empirical observation. No later evidence was found which disconfirmed our initial placement of them relative to one another, nor was anyone else within the Protestant groups at Berkeley later judged more supportive, for example, than Chamberlain, or more reactive than Johnson; our sample includes the full range of expression.

	reactive	the middle range	supportive
individual	Johnson--Southern Bapt.	Gelwick--Cong.	Herbert--Methodist
group	Nishi--Episcopalian	Porter--Methodist	Chamberlain--Presby.

This chapter examines in some detail the four individuals who occupy the "reactive" and "supportive" categories in the typology. The situational factors they perceived as influential, the cognitive and evaluative interpretations they read into proclamation, reconciliation and a prophetic sense of community--these effectively place them within the Berkeley context prior to 1964 and afford data by which the effect of crisis events upon particular ministries may be judged and evaluated.

"Reactive" Actors

The Southern Baptist Ministry--Teman Johnson

We have noted the "home away from home" concept employed by churches to meet religious needs of their students and to retain their loyalties through what was frequently believed to be a fundamentally disorienting experience.[7] This thrust is graphically illustrated by a 1937 Methodist report which declared that "the program of religious work...pours each year into Methodism at least 2,000 graduates who have been trained in the Wesley movement."[8] The Southern Baptist Center shares in this traditional conception.

---

[7] See Shedd, *The Church Follows...*, esp. pp. 281-305.

Situational factors. Johnson traces the local Center's history to the late 1940s. At that time, several children of Lane Seminary faculty were attending the University; in conjunction with young adults from a seminary-connected church, a group was formed which "started meeting on the campus." Johnson was himself a member while a Berkeley student in the early 1950s.

> By the time I went to school here they rented an apartment in a building, which has now been torn down, behind the UC bookstore. Then they leased a house just about a block from here which was used for a student center and a residence. In 1955 they bought this place. This was a girls' boarding house.

It is an imposing structure and belies the numbers of students involved, a point Johnson readily admits.

> We're not large, it's just a handful of students that we minister to; this building is sort of deceptive. It looks impressive...but we probably don't have over 130 Southern Baptists on the campus; half of those are probably commuters. We have probably a group of 15 or 20 that we could count on....

The conception of "home" is perhaps most apparent in the Center's living arrangement. Board is offered to both men and women; room and board is available for women, an arrangement based upon the seemingly reasonable assumption that "if we had the women we probably would have the men...." As with most other religious foundations at California, the Baptist Center has no formal, obligatory relationship to local Baptist churches although "we have very close ties...with one church."

Unique among the campus ministries in our study, however, is the absence of any governing body or board. Johnson's local autonomy, at least overtly, is complete. Supervision is administered at the state level through the Church Services Division of the California Baptist Convention. This Division also embraces, he indicated, "Sunday School training, missionary union, and brotherhood," implying certain aspects of the Baptist understanding of a campus ministry which in Johnson become highly explicit. With no board of directors to shape or counter policy, and no direct dependence upon local financial sources, he conceives himself as enjoying considerable freedom of movement.

---

[8] From "Guidance Through Christian Education," quoted in Shedd, ibid., p. 16.

> Yes, I am very free, within the policies set by our state convention; certainly financial policies. As far as our program is concerned, I'm really almost absolutely free, unless I get out of line or something.

The significance of these statements becomes more apparent as we study Johnson himself.

Values and Value-orientation. "I would say," he avows, "that the most important thing in theology is a personal Christ and a basic commitment and complete and absolute loyalty to Him as a living person"; this fundamental postulate underlies Johnson's entire theological position, a position cast almost wholly in a traditional orthodoxy. "According to the Scriptures, all men are sinners," and the great proclamation announces God's redemptive act through Jesus Christ, by which men who listen are redeemed from their essentially sinful state. "I'm really here," he asserts, "to convert students."

The background Johnson brought to California includes, we have noted, graduation from that institution. First a junior college student, he transferred to Berkeley where his "major" was English; "I didn't have a single course in sociology...(or)...political science." Seminary training leaned heavily toward Biblical studies, supplemented by electives "like apologetics and third year Greek." Was specialized training a requisite for campus work?

> I never really planned to be a campus minister; it just happened. Until the time I took the job I would have said 'I really don't care to go into the work.' Therefore, I had no really specialized training except probably from the fact that I enjoy being around young people and I've always enjoyed a little philosophy and I've enjoyed good bull sessions and discussion groups and stuff like that which are a usual part of college student lives.

Such training, even if defined and desired, would not, apparently, have been available to him. "Our seminaries, as far as I know, do not have any particular program like Pacific School of Religion here does to train campus ministers." Why, then, a particular ministry addressing itself to those within a single social institution? Because students have "certain characteristics" which render the residential parish church an inadequate instrument for effective contact and conversion.

> One is a basic ability to really question what they're talking about, to think it through deeply, an unwillingness to accept trite and simple answers. They hate parrotted phrases--I mean, if you say it in the way it has always been said, although it may be true, they won't accept it because they are looking for the fresh, the interesting, they're looking for the intellectual.

This has particular relevance for the Christian message because the university is viewed as a potentially destructive force for the uncertain Christian student. Confronted by professors who reject religious values, impressionable students are likewise inclined to reject. This attitude seems basic in Johnson's understanding of his own ministry. Citing what he said was a hypothetical example of an instructor who "can go along with T. S. Eliot all the way up to his conversion" but scorns that which follows, Johnson believes "we have to at least act like we know this is going on... to know that they're going to have that in the back of their minds; here's this Ph.D., a man that's the symbol of success--he's rejected the really Christian viewpoint...." It is the campus minister who steps into the breach, for having understood that these assaults upon religious integrity take place with regularity, his response has a measure of equanimity and reasonableness not wholly characteristic, Johnson believes, of the parish ministry. "Reasonable" and "intelligent" are not to be confused with intellectual, however.

> This is not to say that I think we ought to be intellectual; this is a mistake.... When I first came here I thought the university student had to have an intellectual approach, that he wasn't interested in dynamic, dogmatic religious thought, that he wanted something that was abstract and complex. But then I find that in my own personal experience this doesn't really help a student. I can talk to a student about this and our groups can talk to them about this but nothing really happens in the student's life. His problems are still the same old problems. Nothing is really resolved.

One simply does not intellectualize at the cutting edge where God touches the lives of people and commands allegiance from them. The "intelligence," therefore, which he would bring to this student ministry stresses heavily the further aspect of "genuineness." Church membership or increased attendance for student groups cannot be the basis of motivation; a student "can tell whether you're just casually interested in him or you don't really care or you're trying to use them for something." What is finally attested to draws heavily upon the conception of mystery, upon internal change wrought by God's love and power, and not scrutable through rational processes. One does not explain, one only gives testimony.

> You talk to this student because something is happening in your life and you want to share it and you have a feeling that he has needs that need to be met that can't be met anywhere else except on the common ground that you and he have where you've had your needs met and he can come and have his needs met too.

For Johnson, this sense of need as felt and met derives from the doctrinal assertion of the Holy Spirit's immediacy, indwelling and filling those who have responded to the conversion call, and constituting one source of "power for living" available to and characteristic of the authentic Christian life. Scripture also provides a primary source of material through which God's action in Christ is made known, where men find testimony to God's divine revelation. These two are intimately related, for "the filling of the Holy Spirit alone could lead to undisciplined enthusiasm and just the dependence on the Scriptures could lead to certain dead orthodoxy."

The proclamation, therefore, is relatively simple in presentation and is addressed to all men; man as sinner finds salvation and peace only as God's promise is grasped through Biblical study and as he gives up the "old man" to become the "new." With much feeling and directness, Johnson summed it in a single affirmation: "Really, the only hope for any student is a real personal Christ."

Reconciliation in this frame of reference thus manifests itself in a new relationship through which men are obedient to God's will. For Johnson, the signs of this reconciled state were not difficult to discern. When asked rather specifically about relationships he believed existed between "the new life in Christ" and the academic world, he postulated as an example of his own choosing a student concerned about failing grades and the response he makes in such instances.

> Well, I would say, probably, to the student, I would take a little time to find out some of his personal traits, to go beyond his statement, 'Well, I'm not making good grades.' 'Well, why not? Can't study? Can't concentrate? Something wrong at home? A girlfriend?' Then I would tell him really that I had found in my own personal experience that I am the happiest and I am the wholest and I am the most complete person when I am fully committed to Christ. And that although it may sound a little bit strange, a full commitment to Christ, I believe, can bring better grades simply because it helps to resolve the warring, conflicting elements within your own personality, it gives you a core around which to make decisions and judge what's important and trivial, and also it opens up the resources of God and makes his resources available to you...that through Christ we can approach the vast treasury that God has--love and power.

Nor is the case purely hypothetical. Relating descriptive accounts of prayer meetings held weekly with students at the Center, Johnson told of students who pray for "papers, grades, tests, things of this sort." Further, of students who offered thanks to God because calmness of mind permitted a B where previously Cs had been forthcoming. Nor did he find this strange or unusual; reconciliation places individuals within the compass of God's power thereby "helping them to be the kind of person they ought to be and suddenly--well, grades have improved." Johnson, we have seen, understands the spirit of inquiry fostered by life within the university and he defines his ministry largely in terms of relating student concerns, like grades, to that commitment demanded by faith. The very nature, however, of the reconciled life necessitates constant support of and participation with those of like mind and persuasion, and to this end, Johnson sees himself as a direct and vital link with local Baptist congregations. In this capacity, his is not a church away from home but an outpost serving to identify and encourage the Baptist student whose bearings have become badly disoriented in the university's unsympathetic, uncaring environment; having accomplished this, he seeks to channel such individuals into the relatively secure company of likeminded individuals. "This is the ultimate end of our group here, you see."

> It's to reach into the community, minister to the needs of students where they are in terms they can understand; relate the gospel message in such a way that they can accept it, so it will be meaningful; lead those students to a full conscious commitment to Christ; encourage those students then to let God have full control of their lives and lead them then to commit themselves in a local Baptist Church.

Only as this process is carried through to fruition, to identity with a congregation and its reinforcing mechanisms, can the student be assumed reasonably secure.

From this narrow and self-contained conception of the Christian proclamation which seeks conversion as evidence of the Spirit's indwelling and redemption from man's essential sinfulness, the moral, prophetic aspects of life as Christian logically follow. As men are themselves brought into salvation, they become witnesses to God's purposes and promise of salvation for others. To be reconciled is to become a minister, to reach out and spread the "good news." This has, Johnson believes, very concrete implications. When questioned regarding the extensive social action engaged in by several of the mainline Protestant religious centers, he found such considerations secondary.

> I have no real intention of directing the ministry that way. It's not because I feel outside pressure or feel it would be wrong because there would be no problem with that...we're very free here, as I told you before. It would be because I think there is something more important that is our particular task.... I would never discourage our students, if they would come to me and say, 'They're going to have an organization meeting for a civil rights thing and should I go?'; I would tell them this: 'If you can be distinctively Christian and can bear your witness for Jesus Christ and feel that God can use you in this way, then I would encourage you to join the group, and if the principles and motives and objectives of the group do not conflict with your real loyalty to Jesus Christ, I would encourage you to do so.'

Several interesting and significant points emerge from this paragraph and speak to Johnson's understanding of the "new life in Christ." In his phrasing of the student's question, one notes the "they"; no possibility seems to exist for indigenous concern within Baptist groups. "They" organize, "I" join, a nuance likewise present in the paragraph's last sentence. Also apparent is a sharp dichotomy between witness as an evangelistic effort and all other forms of outreach. Thus, civil rights may be acceptable but only when weighed against one's "real" loyalties to Christ, and social action as a legitimate form of Christian witness is minimized. This dualism was explicated with vividness as he discussed Stiles Hall, the University YMCA; commenting upon the large number of social programs supported there, with a corresponding lack of any identifiable religious position--"I think they have none"--he felt constrained to say:

> I read their paper. And I've read such things in their paper like 'Christians do wrong to remain in their cloisters and go to Sunday School and church; they ought to be out now giving expression to their

> faith by marching in civil rights marches....' I don't like this idea that all missions in the past has been Yankee imperialism and that people who spend their time in prayer meetings and then go out and witness for Christ are still in the 19th century, that they should be doing something practical instead of praying. This I don't agree with. I really don't.

It is, believes Johnson, a "cut flower ethic," one which may yet bloom for a time, but having no substantive rootage, must finally wither and die, an ethic characteristic not only of individuals but American society generally. As such, that society is "even now living off of some of the fruits of the former days." The reasoning here is again explicit and straightforward. Because all men are sinners, society as such cannot "really attain real developmental satisfaction as a group," and pretentions of progress only obscure this fundamental point. God calls men, not societies, and primary concern for social structure inverts those compelling priorities guiding Christian efforts.

Law and structure are, to be sure, necessary and desirable because the acts of sinful men require curbs and regulation. There is, further, the Biblical mandate--"You read the Old Testament and the prophets cry out against injustice and oppression"--and to the extent that law promotes justice and protection for those incapable of wielding social power in their own behalf, they are worthy of support. As he said, "I still have this basic position that we as individuals should not foster laws of injustice, we ought to try to pass laws that are just toward all men." But it would be a mistake to suppose that society improves in any moral or spiritual way; it does not, and only the misguided believe it can. "Society as such, within itself, is unable to be redeemed." "Filled with Christ" requires witness and testimony to individuals, and only as these "make peace with God" is society affected. Given increasing evidence that men have effectively divorced themselves from confrontation and consideration of Christ's claims upon them, Johnson is not optimistic regarding the future.

This structural distrust carefully eschews easy identification with any political system.

> I think that, really, no matter what structures man has had up to now, there's still been oppression; there's oppression in Russia, there's oppression in China, there's oppression in the United States, there's oppression really everywhere.

One therefore supports "even our grossly unjust capitalistic system" because any other promises additional burdens "as far as preaching the gospel is concerned."

Several important aspects of Johnson's ministry are evident. His value-orientation is increasingly non-intellectual and cognitive; cast largely in doctrinal propositions, it stresses a set of beliefs about man and God which define the fractured relationship historically present and the clearly conceived renewal possible only as men assent to the claims laid upon them by Jesus. As such, they circumscribe what "is," and deeply influence the normative values Johnson seeks to realize. If man's fundamental condition is reducible to descriptive propositions, and its solution a position in time arrived at through hearing and accepting, one's ministry "ought" to make known this condition and call men out of it. This is the essential meaning of "ministry," and the university becomes an occasion for action to the extent that a) all men must hear the Christian understanding of human and divine nature, including those within the campus community, and b) having given assent, they require support and assistance in the elaboration of Biblically-derived principles by which all else is judged. The basis of interpersonal relations is largely, therefore, common agreement to such principles; men seem approached as objects for potential conversion, and action taken within any context must be evaluated in terms of its potential interference with the "essential" Christian task of evangelization. Relationships based upon affections, upon feelings, the sense of "I-Thou" are not, therefore, relational possibilities which occur with any intensity, nor are they actively sought. In such a ministry, the allocation of funds, the use of structure, contribute most essentially to maintenance of belief. The building provides the locus for like-minded Baptist students and a setting for ritual, for student prayer meetings, etc.

Thus, as the crisis bursts upon the California campus, the Baptist ministry must be viewed as marginal in nearly every sense; students of prior Baptist conviction form its entire constituency, and with no conception of ministry to the university as an institution, as a legitimate concern to which Christian conceptions might speak, it seeks none.

The Episcopalian Ministry--Shunji Nishi

Situational factors. Episcopalian interest in and work with students pre-dates World War II and took place within the context of St. Mark's Episcopal Church, the focal point for St. Mark's Parish, a residential, geographical unit which includes the University of California. During the late 1940s, direct control moved from the parish to the Diocese of California; only since the early 1960s has it, Nishi indicated, "become self-consciously a piece of work that the Berkeley parishes have been concerned about, a focal point or channel for their involvement in the ministries of the campus."

As such, however, lines of authority and control contain uncertainties. Nishi was hired by the diocesian's Department of College Work, which exercises administrative responsibility over foundational activities at all campuses within diocesian boundaries. A second body, the Berkeley Canterbury Foundation, assumes supervision of policy and administration for that particular campus center. Existing as a separate corporation, and composed of both local clergy and laymen, it presumably serves an advisory role to Nishi and oversees the center's immediate operating procedures. Channels for the resolution of fundamental policy questions, however, are not clear, and on matters of crucial importance or in an instance where deep divisions of difference might emerge, Nishi was "not sure which of the two bodies [he] would turn to." Had such an instance arisen in recent years? "No, no. I don't know whether this means that people don't care or they do care to the point of absolute trust.... I don't know what it is." Nishi gave no indication which suggested he perceived interference or restraint being exercised by either body. As with nearly every campus minister in this study, the relatively infrequent meetings of the Canterbury Foundation, and the physical distance between himself and diocesian officials permits considerable freedom of thought and action as the center's programming is implemented on a daily basis.

Values and value-orientations. Nishi, at just under fifty, is the oldest minister in this study. Methodist as a child, "baptized by a Dutch Reformed pastor," he adopted Episcopalianism as an undergraduate. "I had no thought of studying for ordination until some time after college, a couple of years...." He was then in graduate school; having made this decision--"I suppose the primary dynamic behind it was social concern"--he entered and graduated from Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge.

> During that time I suppose the real dynamic which had originally been social concern and social action somehow shifted to the academic, an awakened concern for theology in its disciplinary sense, and after a couple of years in the field...I went back to graduate school....

"Graduate school" was Union Theological Seminary and Columbia University, where he received the Ph.D., specializing in the philosophy of religion, "a euphemism for systematic theology."

This is not to say that the original impetus for social concern died out

> or that I didn't see any use for it, but the other side really gained ascendency, the concern for the academic discipline of theology as such.

"I have since," he indicated, "been in a predominantly teaching kind of ministry." He was, in addition to his responsibilities at Canterbury House, teaching theology at the Church Divinity School of the Pacific when this study was conducted.

Johnson, it was observed, expressed considerable distrust of attempts to "intellectualize" the Christian message. Biblically-derived cognitive statements regarding reality are givens to which assent is required and from which flows the possibility of transforming experience, the new relationship characterized by the Spirit's infusion. It is, thus, evangelism in the classic sense of that word, demonstrating considerable clarity in its answer to the ancient query, What must I do to be saved? Believe...and you shall be saved.

Emphasis upon cognition is also apparent in Nishi, but the point of departure differs; "I see religion primarily in response to that which is ultimate in one's life. Now this can, of course, change from day to day, but, I suppose this is what Tillich really means by the unconditioned, the unconditioned response and that which is unconditioned for the person as he makes this response. This response I see to be primarily one of affirmation of a relationship called faith...." Theological thought and discourse must necessarily be grounded, he said, in ontology and the doctrine of revelation implicit in it; "here I obviously don't mean any kind of propositional revelation--God spake these words, etc., etc." It is, rather, revelation expressed ontologically; the subjective Logos, the human creature, apprehends the objective Logos, that which is unconditioned, the ultimate, and to this men respond in a sense of dependency.

This is faith, expressed, Nishi believes, in a three-fold manner:

1) the rational, "where you give a Logos-type of articulation to what this relationship really is...affirmation in creedal form, perhaps; even this is a symbol, but then to ask all the questions one does ask about what is said in the creeds"; 2) cultic activity, a redramatization of the relationship with the ultimate, the acknowledgement of dependence, the sense of salvation, a sense of whatever constitutes the bases of relationship, "and I think I'd like to give the word cult the widest possible meaning rather than just the formal aspects of cult, the reinactment or the dramatization of this relation"; 3) a sense of relation to others who share similar relationships of dependency with God, a conception of creation in which men, although fallen, discern an objective, created order and his relational position in it.

From this conception of objective reality and the subjective, human comprehension of it, proclamation emerges as the recognition and rational explanation of the structured system within which all creation exists. It is the positing of questions which seek after the nature of reality and the systematic ordering of men's understanding of that reality. The university as a locus of serious inquiry and reflection provides, therefore, a very natural setting for a Christian ministry and, not surprisingly, Nishi verbalizes this relationship not only in terms of distinctive insights derived from Christian faith which aid in the university's self-understanding but, likewise, as a flow from university to church of the ever-expanding knowledge of creation, of the world, produced or discovered by the academic community. Nishi characterizes this arrangement as a "channelling function" which seeks "real intercourse, an exchange of thought and ideas...." In this manner, and unlike Johnson's appeal to the isolated individual, Nishi conceives of a ministry which actively and openly affirms the life of learning, which recognizes the vital element Christian thought has supplied in the university's historic development,

> ...keeping as much as we can in the forefront the point I think Whitehead was making when he was saying that the confluence of the Judeo-Christian notion of creation and the Hellenistic conception of philosophy made possible the emergence of science as we know it.

This defense of higher education emerges with great clarity in an article written by him in response to statements charging a causal relationship between university size and perceived "dehumanizing" influences. "It is," he notes, "virtually axiomatic that a public university is large" because "the facilities required for advanced research in the pure and applied sciences require the financial resources and personnel strength which only the large institutions can begin to provide and to attract from other sources."[9] The gains from this size factor and its concomitant concentration of physical and mental resources are viewed as considerable, offering "enrichment, diversity, intensity, [and] the excitement of a variety of new frontiers being simultaneously explored." Mechanization of the person may be potentially greater in such a context, but "the problem at heart is the nature of man and not simply the 'institution' or 'organization'." Because this is so, a second aspect of the Christian faith which speaks meaningfully to the university community is "the real appreciation of the nature of persons," the recognition of human complexity and its full development and enhancement only as people interrelate through conceptions of community. As a spokesman for the faith, the campus minister, Nishi believes, must insist upon "the critically crucial Christian concern for the person," while likewise indicating that size and "depersonalization" bear no necessary correlation one with the other.

---

[9] Shunji Nishi, "Faculty and Campus Ministry," Humanity, February, 1965, p. 7. Although written during the crisis, its introduction here usefully illumines his understanding of the university.

Proclamation, therefore, posits God as the absolute, as the unconditioned to which men respond in a sense of dependency and inquiry. Asserting the reality of creation, faith affirms the university as discoverer and articulator of the rich complexities characterizing creation and man in it.

In this formulation, little of Johnson's emphasis upon man in sinful, open rebellion against God is evident. Man is indeed fallen, but the sense conveyed suggests incompleteness--man is part of a created whole--rather than the language of restoration used by Johnson in which belief in certain doctrinal assertions, and a willed decision to acknowledge Jesus as the restoring agent, results in a changed man-God relationship. In Nishi, emphases speak of process, of the rational, intellectual apprehension of the Absolute, and reconciliation occurs when men's ultimate loyalties reside in that Absolute, when men recognize the partiality and incompleteness of human constructs--political ideologies, societal structures, etc.--which frequently compete for men's allegiance.

As noted above, Nishi also stresses conceptions of community and the position of persons within them; having intellectualized and systematized the question of reality, men redramatize their sense of dependency and need through the church as "the gathered." Nishi is highly critical of Cox's insistence that "church" need not, of necessity, imply more than small groups of Christians temporarily grouped around a common interest or function.

> I find it a little too simple to characterize our Christian people on campus as being the church and being there is all we have to do. Christian people have to be gathered in order to know their own identity as Christian people and as a church. I find it hard to understand what the scattered church really means. The church is church only when people are gathered. When they are scattered they're certainly Christian and somehow are acting as church people, but their identity as church is not the predominant thing; their identity is as Christian people molded by and informed by the Christian faith and the life of the church.

This strong accent upon the church as a vital sustainer of Christian life seems analogous to what was observed in Johnson, but subtle differences ought also to be noted. Johnson, it is recalled, placed considerable stress upon church participation for the strengthening of personal commitment and for continued instruction in Biblically-derived systems of correct doctrine. He likewise encouraged formulation of principles, also Biblical in origin, by which personal conduct might be guided and judged. Although dichotomous summaries do this position an injustice, primary emphasis is the individual. Prayer meetings likewise serve this function, couched most frequently in petitions to God for specific results or action deemed desirable or necessary for the given individual. The supportive element is also present in Nishi, but the conception of community more frequently and strongly stresses the organic nature of the church, the interrelatedness of the Christian life. As Christian, men share a history, they share a tradition, and only this common participation gives coherence and wholeness to the life of faith. Thus, ministries to the university may indeed stress the cognitive, the life of learning; they must also seek to relate individuals to one another in groups which counter the potential existing within the large university for "dehumanization." This is the reconciling task confronting the campus minister.

How are such concerns to be implemented? How shall the university as a diverse, enriching institution which consciously seeks the expansion of "new frontiers" of knowledge be supported and encouraged, while men who live within its context are brought into communal relationships?

> The way in which we try to carry this on is to take small groups of people who themselves can exercise a ministry in this dual direction: one, on the campus, and the other in the church.... Through small study groups I think we're, well, let me put it this way; I think that basically one of the things we are committed to methodologically is the development of leaders...we're involved in bringing as sharply as we can

> to the forefront of the thinking of university people their responsibility and their roles as a part of the campus ministry. They're involved in a ministry which certainly doesn't mean Bible-waving evangelism, but rather bringing to bear on the university those distinctive insights of the Christian faith which will help them as persons and the university at large.

What characterizes such a group? And Nishi's participation in it? Nishi spoke of "several" groups, varying on the basis of interests, talents, and "the maturity of the people involved." His concern, he indicated, was to foster a sense of vocation, a sense of identification with the essential intellectual aspects of the life of learning, while "trying to keep before them the fact that they can't do this except as they are consciously related to the community we call the church." This strongly suggests, it would seem, that such groups would necessarily be Episcopalian in composition, but Nishi resists this as an unwarranted constriction of the ministry he offers. Illustrating his contention, he referred to a group sustained by him for several years called Skeptic's Corner. While never large, "at times just two or three," it has met weekly, employing as its only criterion for attendance an expression of "honest questioning the Christian faith."

> At every point I think they are asking questions in which I can safely say there has been an attempt somehow to bridge theological questions, theological statements with life, with their own lives as involved in the university.... So in this case I guess I'd say that I or one of my colleagues might have been the representative of the church as somehow trying to develop an interest, to inform these people, so that even without the consciously Christian, let alone formally Christian, some sort of influence might be exercised through them. If as a result of this they happen to develop some interest in the Episcopal church, then all right, but this isn't the primary purpose.

The tension remains, however. Discourse on the fundamental issues of belief and faith, he believes, is crucial to a systematic ordering of and knowledge about the apprehended Absolute or God. But men also require, it has been noted, community, and to this end, weekly celebrations of Holy

Communion are held in St. Mark's Episcopal Church, immediately adjacent to Canterbury House. Nor is this simply a "borrowing" of facilities; "technically, we would say these are parish services, because every formal service of worship, I feel, has the parish church as its locus, its logical locus, for this is where the people of God really assemble, the parish church."

When asked to identify typologically the form of ministry most characteristic of Canterbury House, Nishi felt it simpler to indicate what it was not; although he had no difficulty in typing each of the other large denominational centers, he concluded that "where our primary emphasis would be I don't know." This was, upon further questioning, modified: "I think we have a fairly strong orientation in the pastoral direction which is not to say just holding hands with, well, we are concerned with individuals as people." This lack of clarity becomes most apparent as one moves beyond the formation of discussion groups and the concern for pastoral functions, of which the Communion is one, into conceptions of the life of fellowship as it actively relates itself to the moral re-ordering and re-structuring of society. Nishi readily admits, we have observed, that faith as response to and dependency upon the Unconditioned involves a relationship with others who also share this sense of dependency; the moral implications of this relationship derive from the ontological, objective nature of reality. The implications of this for programming, however, for the use of physical facilities available to him, seem vague and unclear. There is no evidence in the record of Canterbury House over recent years that explicit questions of social concern have played any significant role in shaping student activities.

Such is the Episcopalian ministry and the complex man who directs it, cast largely in pre-crisis terms. Both become more explicable as the crisis erupts across the Berkeley campus.

Supportive Actors

We have seen thus far two conceptions of a campus ministry which, although differing at significant points, share in common a concern for the institutional church and the relationship of Christians to it. One essentially grounded in a traditional, doctrinal formulation of evangelism, the other in a rational analysis and discussion of theological belief, both derive from long histories within Christianity. These traditional forms, however, particularly the former, have come under increasing criticism during recent years for being primarily student-oriented, for drawing students into separatist, protective groupings which frequently isolate such individuals from the main currents within the university or, for failing to adequately appreciate a life of faith outside the context of the denominational, residential church.

Such criticism has most often flowed from religious thought which minimizes the usual distinctions of "sacred" and "secular," seeing God's activity in many facets of human activity: in social change and conflict, in political movements, in the struggle for basic human rights, in governmental bureaucracy, and in the university, no less than the church. This means that "Christians do not bring God to the college. The community of faith points to His presence there as in all the world, acting to redeem humanity in Jesus Christ. Because God's saving activity extends to the entire world, the church on the campus must deal with the entire life of its members and of the academic community."[10] The campus ministry is no longer conceived as standing apart at the periphery but assumes supportive concern for the university's internal life. In this role, any issue in higher education is seen as legitimately addressed by the campus minister. But how does this concern receive implementation? What structures, given the minimal recognition extended by state institutions like California, permit ministries "within," permit consideration of religious points of view, permit attention to the "entire life...of the academic community?" The two men considered below provide interesting insights into this new emphasis in the Protestant understanding of higher education.

---

[10] Charles S. McCoy and Neely D. McCarter, The Gospel on Campus, p. 95.

The Experimental Program in Ministry to Graduate Students and Faculty--Walter Herbert

When Charles McCoy became professor of Religion and Higher Education at Pacific School of Religion in 1959, he recalls sensing very little involvement with the university on the part of most Berkeley campus ministers. None, for example, had studied the university's master growth plan which projected the considerable expansion then developing, nor had serious thought been given to new structures and programs which might reach the overwhelming majority of students who failed, of their own volition, to frequent the various denominational centers. More particularly, no plan had been formulated which took adequate cognizance of the mushrooming expansion of graduate study. As a Methodist, McCoy posed the question: What can Wesley Foundation do that could influence this largely unknown group? Discussion was initiated with campus ministers and officials of the Methodist church; the result was an experimental ministry, funded by the Glide Foundation of San Francisco, which called Walter Herbert to the California campus in the summer of 1963.

Situational factors. No other situation in this study approximates the degree of freedom from administrative responsibilities consciously incorporated into this graduate ministry. No procedural expectations were imposed, it being deemed desirable that both method and objective should and could emerge from the cumulative experience of whoever was to be placed in the position. Lack of a history means lack of precedents; Herbert was free to move within the graduate community in ways of his own choosing. His office was placed in the Wesley Foundation building, although he was not responsible for foundational programming or activities.

In this non-structured arrangement, Herbert reports to and consults with three groups; primary is "the guiding committee of the experimental project," composed of the Glide Foundation's program director, Wesley Foundation director William Porter, the Methodist district superintendent, and two local clergy. Also concerned is the Board of Directors of the Wesley Foundation. The third group--McCoy and two university professors--forms a team of consultants to whom Herbert may turn for counsel and direction. His initial misgivings regarding this arrangement proved unfounded. "They've been extremely good; it really couldn't be better, about letting me have my way, and doing what I thought was best to do." Sufficient funds were also made available for implementing programming and projects Herbert believed necessary or desirable. Indeed, amounts exceeded that which he felt could be creatively utilized, and potential income exceeded expenditures during the ministry's first year by several thousand dollars. Comparatively, therefore, the degree of freedom from institutional control and responsibility seems both considerable and unusual.

Values and value-orientation. Describing his first year, Herbert wrote that "it is an abiding concern of this ministry to find its way toward proclamation of the Christian gospel and explanation of Christian understanding in as intelligible form as possible,"[11] a theme which is, on the face of it, reminiscent of Nishi and Johnson. The meaning, however, which attaches to these concepts and language differs markedly. What is the Christian proclamation? What is "intelligible form?" What significance have they in the university context?

Herbert came to California immediately following graduation from Union Theological Seminary, having moved through a religious odyssey of substantial frustration and complexity. The religious certainty of youth--"I was ready to take on all comers as far as whether my beliefs were true"--crumbled rapidly as he entered Harvard College and his reflections on that period are punctuated with a sense of impact, of "purposelessness," of tragedy and "meaninglessness."

> The college time was an immensely difficult time for me.... One of the characteristics of my theological outlook was a kind of optimism about the world and what could be accomplished in it and I'd never encountered intellectual, really personal difficulties of a kind I couldn't cope with.... I worked very, very hard, did very well, but it was an immensely difficult time....

Fluctuations of inordinate sweep appear to have occurred during these undergraduate years. Declaring religious faith to be "rationally untenable," he embraced a faith in reason which, finally, appeared to be equally indefensible. He recalls the influence which Harvard professor Perry Miller, and this man's great feeling for the "demonic" in American literature, exerted during the junior year. The sum of his experience at Harvard resulted in what Herbert called "an extreme decline in religious confidence" and, finally, a crisis of considerable emotional intensity. "I had the feeling of being overwhelmed by evil; everything as rotten and corrupt particularly me." George Buttrick, therefore, "found me a vulnerable subject when he was proposing to people that they take Rockefeller Fellowships and go to seminary." Graduating from Harvard with a Phi Beta Kappa key, he entered Union.

---

[11] T. Walter Herbert, Experimental Program in Ministry to Graduate Students and Faculty, unpublished final report to the Glide Foundation for the year 1963-64.

These themes continued to haunt Herbert during seminary. While there he composed, for example, a movie script which stressed, as its controlling proposition, cosmic anger and rage propitiated by the crucifixion of Christ. Likewise, many of the papers and studies he produced during those three years explored the numerous facets of "anger" and "suffering." Not surprisingly, this sense of deep confusion and fundamental questioning had by no means been resolved as he began his ministry to graduate students.

"Candid dialogue," he writes, "on matters of value and meaning is a place where significant proclamation can occur." But what is to be the content of the proclamation? Of what meaning and value may the Christian speak? Herbert himself felt constrained to reflect upon this question in a treatise written during the summer of 1964 which he titled _The Passion_; here the poetic imagery, the sense of mystery, and the struggle between mind and feeling so characteristic of his thinking and writing emerges with considerable force. Who _is_ this Christ whom we proclaim? And what does He reveal regarding the human condition? Herbert begins with a disclaimer.

> Lest anyone be deceived, we had better confess at the outset that the treatise which ensues is a song in praise of Christ. If the reader can be satisfied only with a realm of reflection in which ideas refer immediately and definitely to clearly definable things, if he wishes to attend to a state of affairs which is in principle amenable to exhaustive and unimpeachable clarification, let him seek elsewhere and let me wish for him in parting...the endless delights of...chess. If the reader is a seeker after techniques and desires information on the accomplishment of proper adjustments, wishes to repair malfunctioning relationships, wants to learn how to handle things (for example, his grief) this treatise will be a great disappointment because it is not a discourse on machinery, but a song.

One begins with "the heart" because this "is where we really live." Or rather would; men have fled in a "general stampede toward heartlessness."

> This great reason is hidden in the fact that the heart is exposed to the ultimate, and lives in respect of the ultimate. The heart finds no rest in the secondary and provisional, but drives through them to the ultimate. But neither does it rest in the ultimate, for its life in the ultimate is a life in agony. It is from this agony that the general stampede takes flight.

Life in "agony"--it can be no other as the "heart" confronts the two possibilities of "ultimate faith and ultimate despair," believing in faith that the drive of the "heart" is met with the "ultimate welcome" of Christ, at the same time suffering from an inervating inner sense "that the heart's drive is itself absurd...that all which happens jerks it toward the void." The conflict, thus, is not posed as with Johnson in terms of the individual in confrontation with potentially sinful acts or social structures but rather as internal conflict, as agony, as a wrestling with possibilities of great extremes, toward and away from which "the heart" presses as it clashes with itself. No self can long endure such agony of spirit, and so men construct "consolidations of meaning" which "claim to embody ultimate values and protect against ultimate threats," consolidations which place gods--truth, family, freedom, beauty--at the center, gods which provide the focus for the heart's drive toward reality. Yet delusion is inevitable, for such gods, such religions, distort the true human situation; men look out from their defensive consolidations only to "see that others have taken standpoints that contradict their own" and "they come to see each other as deadly enemies." Men flee to and embrace those whose gods resemble their own; they flee from and reject those whose gods they fear, and they "cannot deliver themselves from this wrestling of faith and despair."

In an analysis of Job which follows, Herbert introduces the first tentative resolution of this stated condition.

> The Bible knows a faith in God which is distinct from faith in the

> Gods.... From multiple loyalties attracted by the numerous realities which evoke trust in the heart the Bible calls us to trust in the One who embraces all reality and who gives us every good thing.

Herbert derives from the story of Job the first Biblical thrust toward resolution of the enduring conflict between religion as an ultimate faith in God and religion as a "prudential manoeuvre" by which men seek to manipulate and coerce God through their own goodness and rationality. But Job has not entered into "a new existence," he has not encountered "ultimate faith," and the redeemer Job's vision dimly perceives must await Christ. "With Jesus that which was spoken in promise is realized in fact." It is in Jesus that men are confronted by one whose existence assures them that life in ultimate faith requires no defensive consolidations.

> Into the life which we live in bondage to defenses and in agony between ultimate despair and ultimate faith comes the one who is innocent of defensiveness, whose life is founded on ultimate faith. He meets us in the depths of our lives, in that fructifying and ominous darkness where all our meanings have their rootage....

Because he was defenseless, because he came in complete openness to men, he is put to death by those whose defensive consolidations stood threatened by him. As the complete expression of ultimate faith he is destroyed by the ultimate despair in men.

> He bears the consequence of our bondage. In the killing of Jesus our ultimate despair reaches its paramount expression. The fundamental corrosive exposes itself naked and specific; it comes boiling through the surface of life, out of its hiding beneath convention, apart from its mixture with faith, and spews itself against the one without defenses.

Through Christ and his death, men are freed from defensive postures and called out of their partial religions and gods. Men need no longer fear the possibility of "ultimate disaster," for their lives have been "invaded by an embracing love, which has explored the worst depths of our despair, and which now informs our faith."

> We do not expect to be protected...for we have received no power by which to defend ourselves against the actual and often hideous misery

> which is present in human life.... We have, rather, received the offer of fellowship with the One who bears with us what we bear.... We do not even expect that we will walk in utter faith, for we know, in the testing of each moment that our despair continues to wrench us. But we do expect that God will keep faith with us, to test us, that we shall not remain strangers to ourselves.... We are enabled to walk forth with the one who leads us in a life of faith and courage and compassion....

This relationship with Christ, the mechanisms by which men's lives are "embraced" by love, are not clearly delineated here, nor does it seem intended or even possible. In another context, discussing this same phenomenon, Herbert implies the fragile, non-rational nature of the human-divine encounter.

> So we are approached by one who knows us and loves us. And the approach is not imperious or coercive, for it beckons us to find freedom. It's something like a Bach fugue, played on a recorder; a piercing music, with a strange integrity which makes sense in a profound way, so that a depth in us which waits and aches for something that makes sense, leaps up to meet it.[12]

The invitation thus offered, the proclamation made to those within the academic setting, involves the Christ who, in his complete openness to men, calls them to be and do likewise. It is a Christ who meets and clarifies the "heart's" thrust toward both ultimate faith and despair, and in so doing dramatizes the deadly incompleteness and animosity fostered by the religions and finite gods men create. Such conceptions, we have noted, insist upon almost no doctrinal formulations, for they are relational rather than propositional. They are also highly personal, stressing a sense of "radical openness"; as such, no conception of the institutional church is required and none appears. In the report to the Glide Foundation referred to above, Herbert speaks of "penetrating areas in which the church needs to have its presence felt," but the word is misleading if by that one infers structure. His is largely a solo ministry and he is the church's presence.

---

[12] T. Walter Herbert, "O, Freedom," March, 1965. Unpublished sermon, Wesley Foundation, University of California, Berkeley.

If men stand separated by "defensive consolidations" whose destructive nature is made known through proclamation, reconciliation must seek to draw men out of them, to eliminate or at least recognize doctrines and structures which impede humane relationships; not surprisingly, therefore, Herbert's ministry has placed great stress upon interpersonal relations and he has understood himself to be "a person who can engage individuals in conversation about Christian faith and the relationship it has to their own lives...." This is somewhat more formally stated in his Glide Foundation report as he speaks of breaking "the silence."

> The absence of basic dialogue on matters of value and meaning, the absence of significant discourse on how one makes sense out of life, the absence of philosophizing on questions concerning man's place in the cosmos, concerning how man's life is to be governed with regard to the truth about man, concerning what it means to follow the good, concerning what it means to be a human being: this is the silence of which I speak.

The question of conversation and dialogue assumes great importance within the academic community, for it is here that Herbert believes the large and fundamental issues of truth, of the good, of life's meaning, have traditionally been reflected upon, where points of view have mutually challenged each other in the light of man's increasing knowledge of himself. In conversation, ideas become personal, they are tested "against the fabric of one's experience"; hidden assumptions and value premises are made explicit. In the "silence," however, viewpoints are seen as discrete, laid out and lived without confrontation and mutual criticism, and the student comes to believe that judgments of what is ultimately valuable and worthwhile must be separated from the academic pursuit of knowledge. Thus the university atomizes itself into specializations and disciplines which pursue their disparate courses, "largely ignorant and sometimes suspicious of the activities of each other." These, for Herbert, constitute the principle failings of the large university: it has permitted the development of a dichotomous distinction between "trained intelligence" and "wisdom."

This dichotomy provides a foundation for the church's concern for higher education. Because the university has abdicated a traditional responsibility, "human damage is being done and human potential left unrealized so that, as a work of responsible love, we should do what we can to help remedy the situation." This "remedy" seeks to bridge the chasm perceived between knowledge and values; it requires that "basic dialogue" occur where Christian faith and understanding can "illuminate the relation of what [Christians] believe to what other people believe." At one point he speaks of himself as an "evangelist offering an invitation to a kind of struggle, which one wishes to stimulate on the grounds that it can be fruitful." As we have seen, the use of "struggle" here is consistent, once again focusing upon the process itself, rather than rigorous, propositional content requiring assent. Indeed, God approaches men in varied ways, and His word "is not bound to any particular language or set of phrases." He speaks both to and through men when they confront one another "in an atmosphere of openness and common concern," and as Christians, He makes Himself known to others "especially as we speak of what he means to us in open and candid dialogue."

It is, of course, one thing to talk of "dialogue." It is quite another to fruitfully promote it. His constituency was, potentially, the 8,000 graduate students in residence during 1963-64. In actuality, however, he had no constituency; with no official denominational responsibility, he was in effect given the entire campus within which to move.

> So I set about this business of moving around, trying to find the places where people would be engaging in the kind of conversation about themselves and the world toward which a Christian presence would have some kind of relevance, into which one could speak, and I was really surprised to find that this didn't seem to be going on....

The "beatnick" community he found "disappointing," very much inclined to "sit around, soak up the sun, and go barefoot." The extreme hostility members of this group displayed at a university appearance of Madame Nhu "closed the door" to "these people." Other small groups and individuals proved somewhat more receptive to this young minister and the Report outlines his "invisible parish."

> I say 'parish' because I am not speaking of a congregation or of a group of people whose life can be seen to cohere around Sunday worship. I say 'invisible' because the parish is not defined geographically. I am speaking of a complex of relationships between me and certain individuals and groups of individuals, some of whom are acquainted with each other, some of whom are not. They constitute the body of those who are being reached by this ministry.

The "parish" consisted, after his first year, of some seventy-seven people which he could break down into eight "settings," ranging through a mealtime group, classes, an interdisciplinary group, the graduate student commission of the University Church Council, a Methodist group, a theological group, a faculty group, and individual conversation and counseling. Into each of these he brought his primary concern: how shall the "silence" be overcome? Within each of these, with considerable variation of success, he sought intense personal relationships, primary confrontations where the new sense of fellowship and community, implied in proclamation and reconciliation, might be realized.

It seems accurate to say that Herbert brought the "silence" with him or, more precisely, he brought a conception of dialogue through which basic values could be examined and, hopefully, acted upon; an absence of this characterizes the "silence." A second fundamental problem area became evident somewhat later, a concern for "some of the difficulties peculiar to the lives of graduate students." To be under an academic discipline, he observed, suggests a vulnerability in relation to those who control the discipline, a vulnerability which takes two forms: "administrative and scholastic." Herbert expressed surprise and consternation at the mechanical manner in which administrative rules and procedures were applied or, in selected instances, pointedly misapplied; he likewise found graduate students being used as pawns in departmental controversies. And both of these were exacerbated by the "impersonality" of the general intellectual "atmosphere." Working with the Graduate Commission of the United Church Council,[13] three substantive proposals were suggested which would, it was hoped, influence the departmental situation.

1. Tutorials could be devised in which advanced graduate students tutor, in "either individual or small-group situations," honors undergraduates in their fields.
2. Advantages accruing to teaching assistants in economics, who had "organized," should be examined for possible relevance to other departments.
3. The graduate commission ought to support, by letter, professors whose activity "cuts against the general trend toward impersonality and sterile professionalism."

None of these had been implemented in any meaningful fashion by late spring of 1964 but they indicate the direction Herbert's thought and activity had begun to assume as his first year ended.

This conception of prophetic change, this desire to promote a broadly-based conception of community, significantly dictated the use of financial resources at his disposal. In a telling example of concern and action, Herbert related an encounter with a graduate student in psychology who, during the ensuing conversation, raised substantial questions regarding departmental policies. Since a study critically analyzing numerous facets of these policies had already been completed, its wide distribution was deemed highly desirable. Herbert, therefore, arranged the printing of 400 copies with which "we saturated the department." This action, he believes, was of prime importance in promoting subsequent change within the psychology department; "That's something I feel glad about." He reflected further, at a later time, on this aspect of his ministry.

---

[13] See below, pp. 103-06, where the University Church Council as an organization is discussed.

> I try to be sensitive to what's happening in the university and to encourage people and support them emotionally, sometimes with more substantial help than that, in their efforts to bring about changes in the university... I kind of have a feeling that in some ways I serve as a reference point for people who have these feelings about how things could be better, but, you know, where do you share these, where do you get some kind of feeling of a place where you can mull the ideas through, and get some kind of confidence that you have your finger on something that's worth thinking about?

Self-evaluation of his first year: "I thought a beginning had been made...."

The Presbyterian Campus Ministry--Keith Chamberlain

Situational factors. Of the centers in this study, Westminster House has the longest history as a distinct entity apart from local residential churches. A large brick building located directly across a major avenue from the university, its floor plan and styling reflect the pre-war conception of an essentially pastoral ministry to students, characteristics of which were observed in the Southern Baptist center. Dr. John Hadsel, director of Westminster House, described what this approach emphasized as it related to the University.

> This was all very important, and it isn't surprising that there were a lot of relationships developing with the Dean of Student's office. They became the natural place for affiliation with the University, and there was lots of concern with moral values and all those kinds of things. This is a clue, I think, to campus ministries pretty much up through World War II.

Indeed, the pastoral model appears to have dominated through the 1950s, significantly altered only after the arrival in 1959 of Hadsel, who categorized the emphasis which he and his associate, Miss Joan Nash, have sought to achieve.

> If Joan and I have seen ourselves as anything, it isn't as pastors, but as teachers.... We see our primary task as being theologians of a sort who are attempting to bring the intellectual resources of the faith to students and faculty in order that they can then be more able in this place of learning. This takes the notion that the University is not oriented around the Dean of Students' office, but is oriented around the faculty and the curriculum and around what goes on in the classroom....

This ministerial concept implies, of course, a rather different allocation of funds for programming and alternative uses of the building inherited from the past; "We see the building as a teaching center and a publication center...we see the pastoral within the teaching rather than vice versa."

Teaching is expressed in several ways, the most unique being the Collegium, a resident community of twenty six men and women, "upper division students who are interested in entering into a covenant of study to examine and inquire into the claims and consequences of the Christian faith."[14] Another visible instance of this emphasis is the large, easily accessible library--religious, philosophical, and political--maintained for the use of anyone interested.

A sense of relative security from local church pressure and the concomitant freedom to move in directions having no firm precedent, of which both Hadsell and Nash are highly conscious, derives in significant measure from the Presbyterian system.

> ...we are a Synod agency, and linked to Synod and to Presbytery rather than to local congregations where immediate reprisals are likely to come.... Reprisals on the Presbytery and Synod level take a long time and at that level you have a kind of long-range trust going for you, you have the system going for you....

Because they are hired by the Synod of Northern California's Foundation

---

[14] From a descriptive folder and application form distributed to interested students.

Committee, neither have a direct responsibility to Westminster House's local Campus Ministry Committee, the corporate body accountable for "the building, for the budget, and for relationships with local congregations." Since this committee, also directly responsible to Synod, functions as a source of advice and counsel for Hadsel and Nash, however, mutuality of purpose is obviously desirable. The group's composition is three-fold: local pastors, "and that's just established, they aren't even voted on, they are just automatically a part of it"; lay representatives from the three largest congregations in the City of Berkeley; and members-at-large. With varying modifications, this pattern is recognizable in the official corporate structure of four religious centers in this study; only Johnson and the Southern Baptists are excepted. The rationale for such arrangements appears simple enough. It provides, of course, a needed continuity in the institution's on-going life and a body legally accountable for funds and property. Equally important, however, though considerably less explicit in its usual formulations is the monitering function such boards, by their very logic, assume. A broad spectrum of representation in any functional, governing body strongly implies and/or admits that numerous interests must be served, that multiple views are deemed worthy to be heard and taken note of. The organization will, at least in theory, then seek to actualize the concensus of purpose these deliberations presumably bring forth; in this sense, the organization is a reflection of the state of mind or intent of those who govern. In the campus ministry, there can be little doubt that such considerations are central to the pattern of relationships characterizing religious workers and their corporate boards. "Broad interests" within given denominations, served by the inclusion of laymen on the boards of directors, may well offer important guidance to the center's professional minister; they may also be seen as a forceful hedge against action judged precipitous or unwise by people within local parishes.[15]

In actuality, of course, a number of factors--inadequate knowledge, lack of time or real interest, infrequently scheduled meetings, etc.--tend to minimize most boards' direct control of foundational activities. Likewise, the following conversation suggests certain of the unofficial machinations which reinforce the campus minister's position.

> The core of the committee is made up of the members-at-large category, which is self-perpetuating.
>
> That is the crucial part of the committee, isn't it?
>
> Yes, these are the key people that we ourselves, with the continuing key people, recruit and bring into it. And on them we depend for most of the committee....
>
> Strictly speaking, then, it would be almost impossible for any action that this core group approved of to be countermanded by the rest of the committee.
>
> Theoretically speaking, action could be, but practically, it probably would not.
>
> And those people themselves, you indicate, are largely from the University, or at least associated with university matters?
>
> Yes, they are students, faculty persons, and other persons from the university orbit. We also try to include in the 'key people in the congregation' people who are also key people in the university, because they can then be a kind of leaven within the congregations on behalf of the campus ministry. They play a really key function at this point.
>
> In effect, then, you have what might be described as a free hand to move in whatever direction seems most advisable to you.
>
> I would say remarkably so.

Direct opposition from boards or committees is therefore relatively rare. Through access to, or control of, individuals or procedures responsible for nominating board replacements, campus ministers were found to exercise substantial influence on the selective process, hence determining in large measure who will serve. Only one man in this study (see below, pp. 94-95) reported any overt attempt by a board as a whole to infringe upon actions or decisions a campus minister had deemed necessary.

---

[15] Three of the six campus religious workers related instances where congregational representatives had protested specific policies or action being contemplated. An excellent example of this problem involves attempts by several religious centers to adopt "open door" policies. See below, pp. 83-84.

After five years at Berkeley, Hadsel sought and received a year's leave of absence. During the crisis year, therefore, he was in Africa. Nash assumed the directorship of Westminster House for 1964-65 and Keith Chamberlain, having just completed seminary training at San Francisco Theological Seminary, was appointed "graduate intern,"[16] stepping into the situation partially described above. He does not, in consequence, have a "pre-history" at California in the same sense characteristic of the other five men and his ministry is conterminous with the Free Speech controversy.

Immediate responsibilities at Westminster House were minimal by his own statement. Nash assumed most of the administrative duties by "agreement and necessity." He shared with her the Collegium teaching load, which was confined largely to Wednesday evenings. The Sunday evening program, "Open End," was also placed under his direction, but "not much happened there" because, particularly during the second semester, he reports leaving it primarily in the hands of students. He was assigned responsibilities with the Community Affairs Commission of the University Church Council

---

[16] Commenting on his selection, Chamberlain recalled that "they didn't quite know how to handle the absence of John Hadsel for a year. They thought of getting some missionary on leave or something, but that would have conceivably caused some sort of authority dilemma for an older guy to be working under Joan, with whom I've gotten along just beautifully. We've had a great working relationship, but for a guy who's been a parish minister or missionary with some authority for ten or fifteen years, this might not have been so easy. Plus the fact that the pay is very low; you can pay an intern a lower salary than somebody else." Chamberlain remained unordained throughout his year at Berkeley, by decision of the employing board.

"until it withered up and died," an early casualty of the fall's events. Nash also indicates that a deliberate attempt was made by her to free Chamberlain from excessive routine, to stand between him and comment from local congregational sources, thus permitting him maximum time and opportunity for "movement within the university." Only Herbert occupied a less-defined position.

There is little evidence of meaningful contact between Chamberlain and Westminster's Campus Ministry Committee. Although speaking highly of the board's chairman and several of its members, his attidude is best expressed in the following statement.

> To be brutally honest, for practical purposes, it is, as in most church bodies, always the people who are competent, who by virtue of training or amount of time they spend thinking about problems, that really have the biggest voice in policy.... I found the most helpful thing in dealing with this committee was just being open with them, and informing them constantly what we were doing, and then whatever we did was endorsed. We did not necessarily share every view but the kind of ministry we were trying to do was completely endorsed by them.... They weren't really interested in making our decisions for us; they were interested in knowing what we were doing, and when they dissented, that was fine as long as they really knew what we were doing, and were convinced that we weren't being completely irresponsible.

The dominant theme is that of "informing" and little sense of advice-seeking or counsel emerges. This general assessment of the board's temperament closely parallels, it is noted, that of Hadsel, and is clearly an important factor in the generally "free-wheeling" attitudes of these three people involved--Hadsel, Nash and Chamberlain.

Values and value-orientation. By definition, a Christian is "one who believes, or professes or is assumed to believe, in Jesus Christ, and the truth as taught by him" (Webster). Chamberlain reflects yet another interpretation of response to Jesus, one which, although it has a long and varied history, has become increasingly vocal during the past decade. Gibson Winter reflects this thrust in his insistence that "the task of the Church [here meaning committed Christians] is reconciliation of men with God and with one another in human society."[17] Particular stress is placed upon the conception of doing; not what men proclaim, but what they do--"one another," "in," "human," and "society" are each crucial, defining terms.

> I think I see Jesus having become, having been, truly man; I understand incarnation more functionally than physically, as God having radically affirmed created humanity, and I think it's great for people to just be sober human beings, to love, to have passion, to think, to know themselves, to have sex, to do whatever is human, because I think behind all this ambiguity is essentially a good state that reflects a good deal of the intentionality of God the creator. He created these human beings for fellowship with him and with one another in a true community.

This, in large measure, sets the context for Chamberlain's understanding of himself. The proclamation is the "good news" that in Christ, God lives, "reconciling creatures to himself and giving them a ministry of reconciliation, confirming the intention of the goodness of creation." There is not, in Chamberlain, the propositional understanding of man's relation to God (Johnson) or the extended, anguished analysis of "the human condition" which stresses the extreme ambiguity in men (Herbert). The Christian is called to humanness and the emphasis moves quickly to doing, to those acts and structures which create, promote and sustain true humanity.

> The World Student Christian Federation--its latest kick in theology, which tends to be a little cliche-ridden, but nevertheless is very avant garde and usually is about five years ahead of the rest of theology in coming up with what seems to be the latest thing to have your finger on --has been talking about the idea of a Christian presence, you know, where the action is, there you must be. A better description that they have makes it clearer than this; they talk considerably about the listening ministry, understanding and comfort and this sort of thing. And I suppose...I think in terms of a Christian presence.

Ministries to the university do not, therefore, differ significantly from ministries at numerous points in society. The Christian is "there," seeking to promote structures which enhance the quality of people's lives.

---

[17] Gibson Winter, op. cit., p. 164.

In his effort to clarify the distinguishing characteristics of this presence, Chamberlain has recourse to Reinhold Niebuhr's analysis of love and justice: "I'm very impressed with the kind of ethical thinking that is in the traditional line of Niebuhr...and I found Moral Man and Immoral Society to be just a great contemporary text of what's going on...." Christians confront the "always strange and new injunction of the New Testament to love one's enemy, to love someone who is different because he is the object of God's reconciling love...." But love must be recast in terms more directly relevant and operative to immediate situations.

> I would say that a sense of justice or a sense of injustice has been very basic...a sort of prophetic sense of injustice has motivated me.... The oppressed are the ones with whom God identified in sending Jesus to join them and that's much of my motivation, too.

The quest for justice raises immediately the question of how society shall be understood and how Christians relate to it. Emphasizing a doctrine of creation, Chamberlain understands man as called to enjoy, we have seen, the "essentially good state" in which he exists, to work for a genuine "humanness" in the lives of men. This is not, however, an unqualified affirmation of what is.

> Oh, no, I don't mean to bless culture.... On behalf of, for the sake of, rather than on the side of.... I say under God rather than ordained by God.

In this conception, men have partially obscured and perverted true humanity by erecting structures, by creating ways of relating to one another, which inhibit "genuine and meaningful" relationships. These are restored only as men actively seek new structures, new arrangements, in which separating barriers are removed. Above all, Christians must be cognizant of life as lived now. "I see the tendency in classical religion to deny plain old humanity and to elevate oneself beyond the mere human," a legacy he believes derives from Greek philosophy. Only a "radical corrective," only religion which takes seriously the present, is now viable.

Words like "power elite," "bureaucracy," and "decentralization" are invoked with considerable frequency by Chamberlain as he articulates an understanding of society, although he shares in common with the other five men in this study an almost complete lack of knowledge about recent sociological and political literature. He is not completely at ease with many of these phrases--"I find much of this terminology to be very unprecise"--yet they provide convenient "handles" enabling him to discuss phenomena he believes are increasingly visible in American society.

> My perception is that there's a good deal of merit to the description of the 'power elite' as the real residence of power in this country.... I think that whatever we come up with we're still going to have power elites.... I am a radical democrat, and I believe very firmly in decentralization. I think this is the way humanization is going to creep in, if it does creep in, to our growing bureaucracies.

It is evident that these words are utilized both cognitively and evaluatively. Belief that certain patterns constitute accurate descriptive accounts of "what is" justify corrective action sought as desirable. Action does not seek the elimination of power and bureaucracy; Chamberlain recognizes that the intricate nature of modern societies requires complex organization. The question is, rather, "the quality of the bureaucracy and how well we understand it and how creatively we influence it at certain points." But how does the Christian understanding of justice and humanness finally provide adequate guides as committed men seek to work in social structure?

> I guess we bless and encourage those movements and institutions which promote the welfare of people, of individuals and groups, in such a way as to provide them with peace and justice and knowledge of themselves, and an understanding of their ambiguity and their estrangement.... I think we can see that some movements are dehumanizing because they rob people of dignity and justice; for example, certain trends in urban growth which perpetuate and spawn new slums perpetuate narrowminded attitudes about those who are different from us....

He seems to have summarized himself well with the comment that "my theology informs me to desire an open society, where people are not coerced...."

As we have observed, proclamation contains little content. Calling men to be "true human beings," as was Jesus, many doctrinal and most ecclesiastical formulations have minimal interest for him. His reflections, for example, upon the mental gymnastics engaged in as he endeavored to work out an interpretation of the historic Westminster Confession (affirmation of which is required of all Presbyterian ministers) elucidate this point. "Yes, we had worked this out ahead of time in our polity class.... Obviously, there are a few things in the Confession which I can't accept...." The fundamental question thus immediately becomes, what does one do?

> The point that my teacher in polity made is that this isn't the point to fight.... We've got a new confession coming in and go ahead and interpret things loosely; you're not being dishonest.... I fought with it awhile, I don't know whether I did the right thing or not.

At the same time, his impatience with most denominational expressions is also graphically present; had these questions arisen during his examination for licensure? No, they had not.

> I'm sure that if anybody had raised the question, had said 'Do you literally handle this stuff,' I'd have said, 'Obviously no, and if we're going to get hung up on that, then you've got the wrong boy; send me to another church, or another presbytery or something like that.... This is my theology; I've tried to outline it for you. Do you want me or not?'

Proclamation for Chamberlain thus has meaning only as it points beyond to reconciliation, to a sense of vision and action which will realize the community and fellowship which proclamation calls for. His emphasis upon direct action is also exemplified at several points prior to his appointment at California. Interrupting seminary education in order to study for a year in Germany under Karl Barth, he speaks of "going out on a limb" while there as an organizer for "the Prague Peace Conference." A similar directness also appears in his summer work with the Student Nonviolent

Coordinating Committee throughout the South, attention being directed toward the "need for community organization, for the plodding undramatic work you have to do in building organizations to educate people, to motivate them...."

Chamberlain's placement within the typology as "supportive" emphasizing "group" becomes more explicable in his discussion of "action" within the context of the campus ministry. Although a pre-crisis pattern of ministry to the university was not available, there being none, he recalls giving prior thought, nevertheless, to the question of implementing his concerns. As a basic premise, "there has to be a ministry to the institution itself which seeks to understand the institution's role in society, its own self-understanding...." This is fundamental to all societal organizations; at the university level, it suggests concern for trends very much in evidence at California.

> I am very concerned with the fact that in the Kerr ideology of the university, this self-consciousness of the role of the university is disappearing, becoming the multiversity, you know; just a training school turning out people responding to whatever society, whatever pressures society puts on them. I think Kerr's idea of the university is very unfortunate. The university has to have a critical role, an historical, critical motif; this is salutory for society, and the future of democracy is pretty precarious without the university fulfilling that role. ... I consider it part of my ministry to the university to help them, contribute to helping them avoid becoming the multiversity as a result of economic and social determinism....

If by multiversity is meant "a mechanism--a series of processes producing a series of results--a mechanism held together by administrative rules and powered by money,"[18] its advent and continued ascendency upon the educational scene appears to be a matter of fact. Chamberlain admits this: "It's partly de facto, true; the multiversity is here. But the multiversity is a moving force, too, and it has an ideology with it." This is the point where he believes action can and should be taken. Numerous facets of university life, for example, may be supported by campus ministers who recognize where power is exerted and what pressures will influence it.

---

[18] One definition used by Clark Kerr, the multiversity's most eloquent, if not prophet, at least descriptive commentator. Op. cit., p. 20.

> It's still a university and there still are lecture series and issues to which people from various disciplines speak with one another. There's still this fruitful contact--interdisciplinary contact--that nourishes good scholarship.

How seriously Chamberlain took his own conception of ministry will become apparent as his involvement in the crisis unfolds below.

CHAPTER THREE

THE BERKELEY PROTESTANT MINISTRY: CONTINUED

On the face of it, a "middle-range" position, understood in this study as "selective involvement," is a bit surprising. That is, the situation's intensity quickly polarized most opinion into categories of "for" and "against." As will become increasingly evident in the following pages, each campus minister expressed a general sympathy for students' protest, for the objectives sought; a willingness to support in any meaningful sense the means by which these might be realized, however, differs considerably and thereby produces the basis of the typology. The two men who now receive our attention occupy this difficult "middle" ground, unwilling to withdraw in reaction, unwilling to offer a full commitment of support. The antecedents of this position we examine here.

Middle-Range Actors

The Congregational Campus Ministry--Richard Gelwick

Situational factors. "I tried," said Gelwick, "to track down the first campus ministry in this church and found that almost throughout the whole century of this church's [First Congregational Church of Berkeley] existence here they have always had some form of special group for college students." It is, therefore, a long history, typified in its earlier years by "strong" classes in Biblical study featuring Pacific School of Religion faculty. Plymouth House as a separate entity dates from "about 1930" and parts of its history are illustrative of the many strengths and problems direct identification with a local congregation brings. A group calling itself the Plymouth Mothers, for example, assumed numerous responsibilities: fund raising, as an advisory board, supervision and chaperoning of the House's activities, etc. Not surprisingly, "the Mothers were very powerful.... This period in some ways is the strongest period of Plymouth House's activity." The advantages are mixed, however. Numerous individuals who passed through the House as California students now, from their vantage as members of First Congregational--"some very influential people in the church"--are inclined to "look back and remember the dances and the great social activity and remember how no adult who wasn't a student there couldn't go into this House...." Such nostalgia is, at least potentially, a substantial conservative force of which Gelwick seems clearly aware.

Current ministerial patterns at Plymouth House coincide with construction of the present building in 1956. An agreement then formalized between First Congregational and the Conference (state-level) of the Congregational Church stipulated that maintenance and control of the building would reside with the local church; the Conference would meet the costs involved in securing and sustaining "a full-time university minister." This suggests that Gelwick, as was true of the four men above, has no direct responsibility to local authority. In response to the question "Are you a member of the staff of First Congregational," he responded with the following comment.

> Well, it's stated both ways. If you read our by-laws of our Board for Campus Ministry you get the neat set of paradoxes which perhaps only those of the Christian faith could come up with. It's stated in the preamble that the Board for Campus Ministry which supervises the campus ministry at Plymouth House is a board of First Congregational Church, and it is related to the other boards of the Church and reports to the annual meeting of this church, etc. It's structured in such a way that half of its membership is from First Congregational. The Board then also includes representatives from the Conference and from neighboring United Church of Christ congregations. So that while the Board is a member of First Congregational Church in one level of structure, in terms of its thought and its composition--representation on it--it's really a larger board. And these other people are invited supposedly to represent, you know, the entrance of the larger church.

This statement points up once again the variation present between the intent and actuality observed in the functioning of foundational boards. Of the twenty one people comprising this Board's membership, nine are elected through the nominating-election process at First Congregational. A tenth is president of the Plymouth Anxiliary--successor to the Plymouth Mothers--who is "almost always a member of First Church," and an eleventh is the president of Plymouth House, who "frequently turns out to be a student who has taken up membership here." The remaining ten positions are distributed among five other local churches and the state Conference. It was suggested to Gelwick that such an organizational arrangement meant in practice that policies of Plymouth House would almost certainly be controlled by First Congregational.

> Yes, I think it's accepted that the building belongs to First Congregational, it's a board of First Congregational, and that the viewpoint of this church is important in any of its policies.... There is a heterogeneity about the representatives of the other churches over and against a homogeneity about the First Congregational representatives.

From an organizational prospective, therefore, an effective ministry seems highly dependent upon at least two crucial factors. Individuals selected to serve must sympathetically understand and support the professional campus minister. Likewise, the campus minister must have access to and support from the locus of power within First Congregational, meaning specifically the pastor and Board of Trustees. What failure at these points could mean was dramatically exemplified by Gelwick's predecessor, as attempts were initiated to bring about an "open door" policy with regard to campus student organizations, to make the facilities of Plymouth House available to all legitimate campus student groups.

> He wanted the campus organization known as SLATE to have the privilege of meeting here for an organizational meeting. And this created quite a crisis in the whole church. People were upset. SLATE at that time was attacking the policies of the University about communist speakers on

> campus--they were not allowed at that time. They were also criticizing a number of the University's regulations. It was felt by members of the Board, and the chairman of the Board then was a professor in the history department, that they should not back the campus minister in this. His invitation which he had more or less given to this group, thinking that he would be supported, was denied.[1]

Clearly, elected Board members were unprepared to support certain aspects of a ministry proposed to them, and this lack of rapport compromised that ministry. Conversely, Gelwick, encountering an analogous situation, attributes a satisfactory resolution to the Board's new composition and his generally harmonious relationship to it. Having approved use of the House's facilities for the University Young Republicans, after consultation with his Board chairman--"He couldn't see why anyone would object to the Young Republicans"--Gelwick felt sufficient precedent had been established to permit the Young Socialists this same usage. What had not been anticipated was the pressure for reversal of the decision brought by the Board of Trustees of First Congregational, and the issue finally culminated in a direct encounter between the Campus Ministry Board and the Trustees, where the Campus Board's numerical strength on the evening these two groups met carried on Gelwick's behalf.

The complex and ambiguous nature of the various situational relationships suggested above has required considerable attention from Gelwick, and are reflected in his ministry more often than seems true of other campus religious workers. Assuming responsibility at Plymouth House in 1963, he indicated discovering much confusion within the Board regarding its power and authority, a circumstance he immediately sought to clarify. By October of 1964, new by-laws had been adopted which placed primary policy determination solely with the Board.

---

[1] A second instance, also involving this campus minister, centered in an invitation he extended to a group at Pacific School of Religion, which had prepared John Steinbeck's "Burning Bright" for presentation in local churches. After much debate, the Board ordered this invitation withdrawn on the interesting grounds that "the theme of the play was not appropriate for church audiences."

> Instead of there being three centers of authority, we began to ask: Which one is foremost--the Conference, the First Congregational Church, or this Board? This answered this question and clarified it.

That major point being determined, attention was then focused upon the question, "What are the goals of Plymouth House?"

> Well, we pulled together a committee that would be representative of some of the more mature students--senior students at Plymouth House--some people who'd been on the Board at least a couple of years and would have some idea of the kind of problem we're wrestling with, and then myself.... What we did, mostly under my guidance, was to take some of the literature in the field of campus ministry and try to orient ourselves.

This "orientation," carried out during the 1964-65 school year with the FSM controversy an ever-present background reality, presents an interesting example of effective cooperation between a campus minister and his advisory board, and is discussed below (see Chapter Six, pp. 220-25). At the same time, questions of local control and influence remain crucial considerations. "It's up to me to sort of assess the weather and decide...it's a discretionary policy, how much we think we can do without creating controversy in this church."

Values and value-orientation. "God," said Gelwick, "is not to be found in any broad sweeping way. You have to go out and discover Him in little fragments." This statement has a long history.

> I grew up in a small town in Oklahoma with a good Methodist church of about 600 people. I suppose it and a Baptist church were the competing churches for prestige in the sense of size and the Presbyterian church had the more consistently prosperous people. It wasn't really a strong church in our town, although they had, I think, the best edifice. Anyway, I feel that that church experience was basically very good....

Gelwick attended college at Southern Methodist University, fully committed to "becoming a minister in my own parish." Forensics, he recalls, seemed highly important at the time; adjacent to the SMU campus was a Methodist church of 6,000 members, and "you get the image that a good Methodist minister is a good preacher." Completing his college work in three years--"I was in a big hurry to get to the seminary"--Gelwick recalls a pivotal experience which occurred during his senior year. He had been invited to attend, at Lawrence, Kansas, a meeting of what is now the Commission for World Mission and Peace, and upon arriving, met a student from Harvard "whose name I don't even remember."

> We had some long talks, and I got very restless about my undergraduate education at that conference, and the feeling that I'd been living in a provincial world. So I went back and wrote to six seminaries--all the good seminaries I had ever heard of.

The importance of this chance encounter is probably difficult to overestimate. Gelwick's unquestioned direction to that point included Perkins School of Theology and a Methodist pastorate. As a result of his new-found restlessness, however, and the letter-writing which ensued, he "elected to go to Yale." And in words reminiscent of Herbert, "that began a process of theological education that was kind of devestating to me in the first two years...." He discovered, for example, that theology was "important."

> That was something I had not yet discovered.... Our chaplain [at SMU] once sent me to hear Reinhold Niebuhr when he was lecturing on campus, but that was an utter loss on me. I can remember the gestures, but I didn't get anything out of what he was saying. I tried to find out; that may be the one struggle I had in college. I remember trying to read some of his stuff after that and being told by one of my professors --William Sweet--that Niebuhr didn't know anything about history.

Yale began the destruction of his "Protestant culture theology" while introducing him to "a Biblical faith" and, by extension, a "rediscovery of myself and everything else." Gelwick left seminary at the conclusion of his second year of study to accept an internship as a campus minister at Temple University, because, he said, one more year seemed insufficient to resolve the manifold questions Yale had raised. The second man to fill the position at Temple ("Harvey Cox had been the first one"), this experience is another vital factor in Gelwick's background.

> I discovered I really liked higher education, but I disliked the higher education I had received in college because it had not really dealt enough with real issues.... I just conned my way through.... I was off debating and doing other things.

The year away from seminary provided for Gelwick a perspective previously missing and he reports that he returned to a third year with considerable confidence. Completing seminary, and "firmly committed to graduate study and Christian involvement in higher education," he accepted a position at Washington and Lee as chaplain and part-time faculty member in the department of religion. This was followed, after one year, by two years of graduate study at Union Theological Seminary, from which he moved to Berkeley, completing the doctorate at Pacific School of Religion in 1964. This religious odyssey also resulted in significant refocusing of theological emphasis. Gelwick enrolled, after his year at Washington and Lee, in the summer session of Union and "spent six weeks doing nothing but Barth papers." This experience, where "I really enjoyed myself, because I really immersed myself," was, he suggested, his first real involvement with a systematic theologian. "When I read Aulén and Calvin and Brunner for Robert Calhoun [Yale Divinity School professor of theology] I was always on the outside of that." Barth's thought remains, he thinks, an essential aspect of his theology, "at least the centrality of Jesus Christ, the revelation event," but his study at Pacific School of Religion, centered in the work of Michael Polanyi, stressed a doctrine of creation, and this appears primary in his evolving conception of a ministry, particularly to higher education.

> I think the whole realm of the creation, of the knowledge that's gained through science, these things have some very direct bearing upon Christian theology.... There is a wholeness already latent in creation...a wholeness to be realized.

Gelwick dislikes use of the term "natural theology" because "I think it will cause us difficulties if we continue to use it," but his concerns stress the value of insights afforded in the scientific, systematic study of men and their physical and social environment, where increasingly the "wholeness" of God's creative activity is being made known. Proclamation thus invites men to respond to this "redeeming and creative activity" and to bring this "wholeness" to light," not in the sense that Christian faith orders and systematizes by imposing its own understanding of reality, but rather as it seeks to discern the activity of God in the world as perceived. Gelwick seems to emphasize this distinction when he suggests that "the difference between the Christian and the non-Christian may be epistemological and not really an ontological one," by which he seemingly means that fundamental questions involve ways of knowing, of perceiving reality, rather than the existence and apprehension of disparate levels of reality. Reality is one; it is the manifestation of God's creative activity and may be grasped phenomenologically by all men. It is the man of faith who knows further that God manifests himself in that reality and therefore seeks to respond, to witness to His presence.

Gelwick's conception of a Christian ministry in higher education flows logically from this basic postulate. Required is a "first-level encounter of the great theological thinking of our tradition with university issues." In the ongoing effort to support the university as a locus of God's action, Christian faith "has some things to say about higher education that are pretty relevant." In its vital concern for the "fulfillment of the human being" the Christian must insist that education develop human potentiality. In practical terms, this means support for the "liberal arts ideal" where "wholeness" of the person is conceptualized and actively sought; "the education in this university tends to neglect that." Gelwick draws rather heavily here upon historical Christian thought. Cardinal Newman, Sir Walter Moberly--these speak for the church's "long thoughts about the university," and in invoking them, Gelwick implies "the university question," the very nature and meaning of the university.

> I don't think 'multiversity' implies complete giving up of a university. I agree that there's a romanticism and nostalgia about Moberly, although it may not be fair to say that about Cardinal Newman since it was the university he founded.... But I would contend that there is an understanding about what is good in higher education that has come out of this discussion that needs to be a part of the dialogue....

Dialogue, of course, implies a duality. "Church" and "university" talk, they criticize, they support and, from this process, they learn and grow. A common theme in much of the prescriptive literature written in recent years by and for campus ministers,[2] it was also an expectation of Gelwick's as he began his ministry in 1963.

> I came with my graduate training as a preparation for this so-called dialogue between the church and the university and the faculty.... But I've never been able to get to it. I have always felt blocked by previous structures that I was expected to do, and the dialogue could be treated in my left-over time--but these are the hardest problems and need the most time.

One further aspect of the Christian's concern for and relation to the university derives, at least partially, from the concern for wholeness. Gelwick spoke of the "crisis of the modern university," its abdication of responsibility as social critic, its current confusion regarding goals, both for itself and the wider culture. The university embraced questions of values, it addressed itself to the fundamental and enduring quest for the good, for the meaningful, for the purposive in human life, in ways the

---

[2] Cantelon, for example, insists that "the campus ought to be the place where the best thinking of the church meets the best thinking of the culture," where "real dialogue may take place between church and university." John Cantelon, A Protestant Approach to the Campus Ministry, pp. 15, 16.

multiversity does not, or at least will not. "The basic things of a free society are tied up here and very much affect us," yet increasingly the university is led by various competing powers and interests from particular segments of society, each exploiting higher education for particular purposes. This constitutes an inversion, a serious reversal of role, made possible largely by the university's increasing unwillingness to take upon itself the mantle of critical leadership it has traded for servitude. It is, he thinks, following Dean Robert Fitch of Pacific School of Religion, "a vacuum that we have in the state university that has refused to deal with moral questions--questions of value and things like this."

> When we have a great debate about this everyone gets really embroiled in a difficult situation without even discussing it. There's just no framework. And I've tried to discuss with students why they believe this or that, and they have felt, 'It's just right.' Their ability to articulate this and to try to analyze it was not present.

The university has become relativist and students thus fail to perceive any necessity for ideals which exist apart from their own concerns of the moment.

> I mean, men cannot form communities around self-interests; there has to be a sense of belief in something, a covenant-making beyond the self, or you really cannot have a viable human community.

These, then, constitute the points at which "faith" speaks to "learning," concerned for both the university's life and form as an institution, and the wholeness, the fullness of those who make up its community; it is the task of reconciliation to bring about the confrontation and dialogue which realize these concerns. This, in turn, provides the basis for new and more meaningful forms of community, of fellowship, in which people may appropriate the complexity and richness of the "whole" Christian life.

Gelwick, like Herbert, assumed responsibility for a ministry to the campus just one year prior to the FSM crisis. Unlike Herbert, however, tradition, a physical plant and prior programming were givens which he could not ignore. As we have noted, for example, the ambiguous relationship of Plymouth House to First Congregational posed issues and problems considerably antedating his presence there; he felt, we have seen above, "blocked by previous structures." The building, too, was premised and constructed upon factors no longer deemed directly relevant. Without real consideration of the University's own expansive intent, the multi-roomed edifice was intended as a center for social activities, for informal meetings, etc.

> [The building's completion] seems to coincide with the growth of sufficient facilities on the part of the University for recreational programs, a well-developed student union program.... The University also had doubled its size and about the time you get a nice building for a campus ministry, it's no longer needed for this social function in particular.

Gelwick continued the then current practice of utilizing much of the building as a study center, open evenings to students as a relatively quiet (dormitories are the point of comparison) location for reading and academic work. Likewise, its large, carpeted room--with fireplace--provided an informal, comfortable lounge. In these respects, Plymouth House is highly analogous to Wesley Foundation, Westminster Foundation, and the Southern Baptist Center. That Gelwick found it very difficult to involve himself enthusiastically with such programming seems evident in the following comment.

> I found this year that one of my students from Pacific School of Religion, who lives here as a trainee, to be very disappointed in me because I'm so interested in higher education, and not as interested as she feels I ought to be in a personal ministry of counselling and, in a certain sense, in kinds of what I feel are distracting activities that don't contribute to higher education. And she would like to see, I think, more of what she calls 'creative programs,' which I see to be rather non-educational....

Another useful insight into his attitude regarding conventional foundational programs:

> I feel that I do less work here than I ever did on a smaller campus in terms of affecting people, of influencing people. On the other hand, I seem to have I don't know how many more times administrative chores, and part of it is the connection with First Congregational Church. I get involved in their decision-making process and it consumes time. That's one of my constant troubles, to help them better understand stewardship with the campus ministry.

Such dissatisfactions, and his intense interest in the university, the relation of Christian faith to the academic community, seem to account for his allocation of much time and personal energy at the level of the Board for Campus Ministry, and the subsequent major study undertaken by it with considerable re-orientation of the Congregational ministry to the campus the projected outcome, though it had not yet been approved by First Congregational. As Gelwick summed up himself:

> Where I think I'm different is I can take the Christian faith as a basis of my self-understanding, but I can expand it a lot further. I can include a lot more subjects and talk about a lot more things if I want to....

He can, indeed.

The Methodist Campus Ministry--William Porter

Situational factors. Wesley Foundation exhibits the now familiar pattern of cooperation with but official disassociation from its originally-sponsoring local congregation. Founded in 1925 when a Dr. Edward Blakeman was called from the University of Michigan (where such movements were first initiated), Wesley Foundation's relationship to Trinity Methodist Church demonstrates varied patterns. Porter was not certain about the period prior to 1940, but since that time, and until 1957, the minister of Trinity Methodist was also the Foundation's director, and men employed to assume responsibility for the Foundation's ongoing programming and activities were also appointed as associate ministers at Trinity Church. Porter's arrival marks the official separation of the two institutions into "two completely independent entities."

Governed by its own Board of Directors, and owning its building and the land under it, Wesley Foundation is responsible to and funded by the California-Nevada Conference of the Methodist Church; as such, Porter believes it "has probably been the central place of effort for the Conference in terms of its academic outlook beyond the University of the Pacific, which is, of course, our Methodist institution here." Its low-lying building, facing the University's south side across a major avenue, is an attractive stone structure, completed in 1956. Much like Plymouth House, however, minimal forethought and planning appear to have preceded its construction and most of the functions for which it was designed were almost immediately assumed by the university. Porter seemed relatively undisturbed by this development. "I think it simply changes the focus of the use of the building. As far as I'm concerned, it doesn't take away the need for the building."

Porter's relationship with his governing board is also characteristic of other campus ministers in this study (with the exception of Johnson) who must balance predominant local representation with their own sense of freedom and what is required of a specialized ministry; these two elements are not, of necessity, compatible.

> Well, we have fifteen men on the Board, and they are divided into three year classes, so that one person can serve three years then has to go off for a year before he can come back on. These are divided...into five representative groups, representing the student council, the people involved in university life, people from Trinity Methodist Church, people from the Conference, and people from other Methodist churches around the area.

The people who make up these various components are not, however, selected by the groups they represent, but are elected by the Conference, sitting in annual session. This, of course, places significant emphasis upon the process of nomination, the procedures through which prospective Board members are placed before the Conference for consideration, as the following conversation well illustrates:

> Yes, that's right, and the nominating is done by our own Board of Directors through the Conference Board of Education to the Annual Conference for election.
>
> So, in effect, the Board is rather self-perpetuating....
>
> That's right.
>
> That is, it nominates those whom it wishes?
>
> Yes, that is true. And in a sense then, I hold a very strategic point at this place because generally I am the one who comes in contact with people who would make good board members, and I refer these to the nominating members of the Board.

This has the effect of producing a Board of Directors, as Porter readily admits, fundamentally in sympathy with his "liberal" views, a Board with considerable insulating value. Such an arrangement permits much operational freedom because policy disputes are, in practice, almost certain to be resolved in his favor. Only occasionally do such issues arise; the following instance seems instructive regarding these infrequent occurrences.

> ...a point of conflict which is very basic, I think, is the role of the Board of Directors in determining the actual ministry rather than merely the context for the ministry. In this particular case...I had been working on the assumption that an informed Board is a better Board.... I had been presenting information...about the University, about the ministry of the church there...until it got to the point where this one particular member of the Board began to express more direct feelings about the program of the Wesley Foundation in terms of its actual ministry, its actual workings and programs; at that point he came into conflict with my philosophy of the Wesley Foundation.... Who runs the Wesley Foundation as a program? Does the Board hire the director and then the director sets up the program? Or does the Board set up the program and then hire someone to come in and do it? So this is a point of conflict.

Or was. The Board supported Porter's contention that programming was not of primary concern to it, and the dissident member resigned. In the more technical language of sociology, "Ego is often allowed a certain degree of role autonomy by the fact that the members of his role-set to some extent neutralize one another."[3] This support has also permitted a remarkably free policy relating to use of the facilities by student social and political organizations. Because "a part of the witness of the Methodist Church is for the openness of ideas...," the building was refused only once, on essentially theological grounds, during Porter's ministry; "We turned down the use for a summer school for Marxist thought awhile back simply because we didn't think this was in conjunction with the aims and goals of the Wesley Foundation...." It would have also "tied up the building longer than we wanted to...."

Although no formal connections exist between Trinity Methodist and Wesley Foundation, these two agencies appear to have achieved a high level of informal cooperation and harmony. Each remains fully aware of the other's prime areas of responsibility; Trinity Church sponsors no student-age programming which might compete directly with foundational activities, while at the same time it undertakes a ministry to "young married students ...recognizing that...married couples often find their fulfillment more in the life of the congregation than they do in a student center." For its part, the Foundation "holds no Sunday morning worship service...because Trinity Church has this and students are attracted to this and this is fine." As Porter summed up such relationships:

> ...there was felt [before the formal separation] to be the necessity for cooperating in a number of institutional ways; now that we are free as institutions, we can cooperate in spirit and in being together where we want to be together.

It seems evident that, on the whole, Porter enjoys considerable freedom in the shaping of his ministry, in the utilization of facilities, and in the creation and implementation of programs and activities. This fluid situation provides the context within which a dramatic personal development takes place.

---

[3] Harry M. Johnson, Sociology: A Systematic Introduction, p. 36.

Values and value-orientation. Director of Wesley Foundation for eight years, Porter's understanding of his ministry to students has undergone a rather remarkable transformation of emphasis. Once holding views highly analogous to those of Johnson, he now employs language and concepts strikingly similar to Gelwick and, at selected points, Chamberlain; he illustrates in microcosm the broad shifts we have seen generally as large segments of the campus ministry have increasingly defined themselves, not in the more traditional pastoral model but as ministers to the university as an institution.

Graduating from the University of California in 1947, Porter completed the Bachelor of Divinity degree at Pacific School of Religion in 1954, having placed particular emphasis upon Christian education. He then served a local Methodist parish for two years as its Director of Christian Education. Porter was not ordained at that time because, he stated, "I saw the task of Christian education as being fulfilled by a layman in relationship to a local church, the church being under an ordained ministry." The directorship of Wesley Foundation was offered to him in 1957 and he brought to it a conception of the ministry which borrowed heavily upon this former experience.

> This position [Christian education] saw, I think, youth or student work as an extension of the local church's ministry with different age groups; that is, this was simply one age grouping within the total church, but the real expression of the church was in the local parish. And what we were was an arm of the local parish working at the campus. This took the form of attempting to reach the undergraduate students in group work and maintaining their loyalty and allegiance to the local church and giving them experiences of the Christian faith to build upon.

Evident in this view is the stress placed upon "educating"; the plan sought to "extend my youth work to those involved in the campus situation," and the context itself remained secondary. Porter saw himself as a representative of the institutional church, charged with maximizing the identification of individuals to it, instructing, perhaps even indoctrinating, always conscious of the protective function inherent in his position as one concerned for the welfare of Methodist students.

Several factors intruded upon this conception. Porter believes there has always been a strong sense of "community" in his understanding of ministry, which he defines largely in terms of primary relationships.

> I think there are a large number of undergraduates in the university who have need of a number of things I think we can offer them; one of these is a sense of community, a sense of belonging, a sense of relatedness....

But "relatedness" and "community" occur where students develop a collective trust and cohesiveness, where students relate to one another in common concern, and Porter recalls the increasingly-felt necessity to confront the academic environment as a basis for understanding his student clientele. Likewise, true Christian community required symbolic expression which was not wholly dependent upon the local church.

> Rather than being student work, it became more of a ministry, and in that sense, the sacraments and the Lord's Supper, and the possibility of performing marriages, seemed to be within the context of the campus Christian community, rather than necessarily in the context of the local church.

Marriages and the Lord's Supper must both, however, be performed by ordained clergy; Porter sought and received ordination in 1962.

Another "intrusion" into his initial view of "campus youth work" came from McCoy's arrival at Pacific School of Religion. Also a Methodist, McCoy played a pivotal role, we have seen, in the formulation and implementation of Herbert's ministry to graduate students. Additionally, numerous seminars, personal conversations, a series of group discussions were employed by McCoy as he actively sought to challenge the campus ministry, both in terms of theological position and understanding of the California campus. Although the impact of this professorial persuasion is difficult to assess directly, both McCoy and Porter testify to its importance.

Effective persuasion, of course, depends upon a certain malleability in the persuaded, and a third significant factor in Porter's religious development is his doctrinal pragmatism. "I may be inconsistent theologically but I have the advantage of not being a theologian and I don't have to have a systematic theology," a position which justifies, he believes, the occasional incongruity between beliefs he invokes. Although reluctant to offer a self-characterization in terms of general doctrinal position, Porter indicated that "I see myself in a very definite liberal tradition of the church.... I would like to recapture, if I could, the real meaning of the word liberal." The precise theological content of "liberalism," however, is not clear.

> In the latest years I have been turning more and more to the historic event of Jesus. That is, rather than talking about a Christology, I think more and more I would turn to the historic event, because it seems to me that this is the most solid point of relationship to me. A Christology or a philosophy of the Christian faith--these things are interpretations to which I then can respond or not respond, and I can have my own Christology and I can, you know, think up all kinds of patterns and so on. But in a sense, that which is really not changeable is the historic event of Jesus, and this I have to tie myself into, and then out of that I have to develop my best understanding of the Christian faith and my best understanding of its impact on society, with whatever helps I can get from other Christians and from history and theology and any other sources I can. Then I simply stand in the midst of all this and, you know, say, 'Where am I? This is the best light I have at this moment and I've got to make a judgment on it.' That doesn't fit into very many systems but....

What Porter derives from the historical event of Jesus centers upon the revelation of God's love of men and the total human response offered by Jesus. In the pattern of most "liberal" thought, Jesus provides a model of moral action, a complete unfolding of potential human relationships. As

Chester C. McCown recently insisted, "For the Christian the leadership of the historical Jesus is the supreme inspiration...[he] was not concerned with Jewish theology...but with morals and religion: the highest ideals of personal devotion and moral conduct."[4] Porter echoes this position, placing particular emphasis upon the quality of life "as lived," upon the conception of creation as an ongoing process in which God's purposes are to be discerned, in which persons are made "whole." Not surprisingly, he believes that orthodox Christian thought has traditionally overemphasized the sinful aspect of human nature; in an inordinate concern for the "fall of man," human creative potential has been insufficiently appreciated. Religion is essentially personal response, rather than "correct doctrines," and he professes little concern for theological debate which discusses life after death, the virgin birth, and other postulates of a similar nature. Thus proclamation declares a deep commitment to persons, to the full and moral life of which Jesus is our supreme example. The very nature of such a position, however, the appeal to Jesus as historical model, precludes the possibility of an a priori content; Jesus is an ideal, whose realization requires constant assessment of current situations. Jesus discerned and responded to God's action in the world; so must men.

In such a position the evaluative seems clearly to predominate. That is, cognitive elements, doctrinal givens, patterns of response which seek a "salvation" from specified sin or sins, are subordinated to questions of the "ought," to meaningful human relationships and the structures which make them possible. And with his minimal emphasis upon the "required," Porter ranges over theological literature in eclectic fashion, appropriating whatever appears useful or enlightening.

---

[4] Chester C. McCown, Man, Morals and History, p. 307.

> I find myself very sympathetic with much of what Tillich is talking about when he speaks of faith as a common phenomena of man rather than a particular formulation of that phenomena, so that to talk about God is not only to talk about the God of Jesus Christ but is to talk about gods of men and we make, in a sense, our choice of the kind of god we will worship.

Likewise,

> I have a real respect for what Harvey Cox is talking about in his book, The Secular City, when he talks about secularization and the secular, apart from secularism...talking about the things that are happening to man in the secular society which doesn't necessarily mean that he's apart from God but rather that this is where God is acting, this is where he finds himself working...where people are finding their freedom from the patterns, from the institutions, even if that institution happens to be the church, that individuals are finding their freedom and are finding their ability to respond and maybe in that sense I'm an existentialist....

Many of the themes noted above appear in these two paragraphs. When it was pointed out to him that he seemed to set up a polarity between freedom and institutions in the latter statement, he responded:

> This is, I suppose, a point where I could be accused of inconsistency, because I am committed to the institution of the Methodist Church, but I think I'm committed...not to the institution but to the fact that it is this community that enables many people to be free, or ought to enable many people to be free.

"To be free"--this, it clearly seems, constitutes the one given that is perceptible throughout Porter's developing conception of ministry; freedom and how it may be achieved. Initially confined to the institutional church, he had, by the fall of 1964, begun to think increasingly in terms of a Christian community whose life centered primarily upon the university. In this view, reconciliation has little meaning apart from the sense of community and fellowship through which it is achieved. The church, of course, has not been abandoned.

> I feel very strongly that there is still a very great need in a university like this and I think in many universities and colleges for a strong undergraduate Christian community where these students can test themselves and test the faith and test their involvement in society and come out committed to greater Christian involvement in the church and giving direction to the church in future years.

But that community need not exist for the student, as student, within the local parish. "I would call it the Christian community wherever it exists...," a point dramatized by Porter's ordination.

> The communion services we hold now on Thursday evenings at 10 o'clock are completely within the context of the campus situation, that is, the students come from their apartments or dormitories or resident units and the structure of the service itself is such that it has primary meaning to the students in the way they want to express their life together as Christians, and where many of them will shy away from the local church communion service when it's announced every month they will very much participate in the service here.

When crisis overtook the university, and students appealed to images of community and loss of self-definition, Porter knew whereof they spoke.

* * *

It is perhaps not surprising that serious cooperative arrangements between the various denominational foundations are a recent phenomenon. As we have seen, each campus ministry, excepting the Presbyterian, had been an integral aspect of a local congregation's programming, concerned primarily with social and religious settings designed to attract students coming to the California campus with histories of such church participation; only in the immediate past had these efforts become broader-based, and cooperation was, apparently, deemed non-essential. Or nearly so. There has been for many years at Berkeley a loose-knit organization to which, by definition, all campus religious workers belong called the Interfaith Staff Workers. Porter described it as "a kind of fellowship":

> It doesn't do anything, really, in programming in its own name. In fact, the student council of the ISW has gone out of existence, so that we have a staff fellowship now...it's a professional fellowship of sorts, in which we share our concerns, our resources, and we talk together about the university and the religious groups and their relations to the university. But it does not program staff responsibilities and it does not organize programs on the campus, except in an ad hoc way.

Requiring little, it accomplishes little, and comments portraying it as a monthly meeting "where not much happens" or "where some of our mutual problems get discussed" were frequent among the ministers in this study. Johnson is an interesting exception to this pattern, speaking approvingly of the activities engaged in by the interfaith staff.

> It's sort of a loose group that comes together just to undertake certain projects like getting the names of students off of cards, getting their religious preference, working together on projects like that or having a speaker on campus....

This comment indicates with some clarity the level at which cooperative efforts were occurring.

We have noted the official unacknowledgment which characterized the university's attitude prior to the fall of 1964; based principally upon legal interpretations of "church-state," the campus ministry was not considered a part of the university community. One small exception to this attitude was achieved in 1961 when, at the invitation of the Interfaith Staff Workers, an assistant dean from the Office of the Dean of the Berkeley campus was appointed as a liaison. Assuming, she said when interviewed, a mutuality of problems, her attendance at Interfaith Staff Worker's meetings has been regular. Hadsel viewed this university arrangement as a logical, to be expected, consequence of prior emphases. With an almost total focus upon students, "it isn't surprising that there were a lot of relationships developing with the Dean of Students' office. It became the natural place for affiliation with the University, and there was lots of concern with moral values and all those kinds of things." The level of mutual concern remained superficial, however; for example, "after a few years of bringing up the same things," meal tickets permitting campus ministers to dine in campus facilities were finally issued. Another recurring problem: Can students be required to state their religious preference on registration cards? For its part, campus ministers were occasionally requested by the

Dean's office to participate in discussions of morality and "character guidance" sponsored by the administration, adding an ethical dimension to the usual medical-social science duo around which such discussions were often constructed. As the assistant dean suggested, "If ministers aren't able to help people find these answers, who is?"

"At a certain point in history"--that is the way Porter recounted the new sense of urgency which culminated in the creation of the most meaningful group established for join action thus far, the University Church Council (hereafter referred to as the UCC). Protestants at Berkeley had previously formed the Protestant Campus Workers' Fellowship which, if somewhat more restrictive than the ISW, was apparently as minimally defined. Several causitive factors seem evident: McCoy's work at Pacific School of Religion had encouraged a ministerial self-conception which emphasized the total university as a proper object of concern and attention; Hadsel also pressed for this "total" ministry. Additionally, an increasing sense of irrelevancy, heightened by much of the literature then appearing which urged commitment "to the total life of the university," and the considerable debate in wider theological circles calling for ecumenicity (as variously defined), are also alluded to as these campus pastors reflect upon that period. Again quoting Porter:

> It was felt that this group [the older Protestant Campus Workers' Fellowship] was not accomplishing anything because its common base of commitment was so broad that it could not operate in a united way. Therefore we began to sense the necessity for a kind of term, a base of fundamental commitment to each other and to a common core, in order that we could move ahead....

"Ecumenicity," although widely discussed at many church levels, often suffers from lack of precision and incisiveness, and its usage may range from a loose notion of cooperation to a rather "global" conception of organic union. If, as Porter implies, broad-based collectivities function on the level of "lowest common denominator," is ecumenicity possible in actuality? By what criteria shall the "denominator" be qualitatively elevated? Where shall the lines of delineation be drawn? Who shall be deemed eligible for this new enterprise where "fundamental commitment to each other" will be the guiding principle? And who shall make such judgments? These uncertainties seem mirrored in the redefined organization which emerged. As formulated in 1961, and presently constituted, "The UCC is a channel for campus ministries of historic Christian churches and seeks to be an expression of unified mission and Christian community in the university."[5] Another central statement in this document reads, "We believe that the only viable option for unified mission at this point is among and between churches."[6] The position set forth in these two sentences implicitly responds to such queries. Immediately disqualified by definition, for example, are the YMCA and the YWCA; neither are seen, or see themselves, as churches.[7] It also excludes Hillel Foundation (Jewish). "Historic churches..." would seem to effectively foreclose on many of the numerous sects currently present with varying degrees of visibility at Berkeley. The enabling document leaves open a possible expansion of the organization: "We must be open to those historic Christian Churches who may wish to join with us...includ[ing]...the Roman Catholic Church [Newman Hall]," but in practice no real effort appears to have been initiated by the present membership of the UCC to expand its present structure; it remains as originally constituted--United Presbyterian, Methodist, Congregationalist, Episcopalian, American Baptist, Missouri Synod Lutheran, National Lutheran Con Conference and Disciples of Christ.

---

[5] From the *Statement of Purpose and Structure of the University Church Council*, dated February 25, 1961, and revised in part, April 25, 1964, p. 1.

[6] *Ibid*.

[7] In many respects, Stiles Hall (YMCA) is perceived by the ministers in this study as being the strongest Christian thrust toward the campus, over time, of any current organization. It has had a long-standing policy of "openness" regarding the use of its facilities by representatives of controversial persuasions, it has usually had a number of ranking University officials on its Board of Directors (Edward W. Strong, Berkeley chancellor during the early months of the Free Speech controversy, was concurrently on this board) and thus appears to enjoy a close relationship with the University's administration. It has, by several times, the largest paid staff. Though deliberate exclusion of the Ys is either denied or attributed to pragmatic concerns regarding a basis for practical cooperation, it is difficult to avoid an impression of a studied inclusiveness by those within the UCC, calculated to secure a voice equal to, though apart from, the Ys, vis-a-vis the University. The YMCA is, of course, very much aware of this split; as one Y staff member remarked somewhat ironically, "The campus ministry was held together by the two Ys for generations," but now "certain of the Protestant Church groups [have] pulled themselves apart and organized

Not unexpectedly, such arbitrary terms of definition have come under strong criticism. A local seminary professor, strategically placed in the deliberations preceding the formal adoption of the UCC's present framework, expressed obvious irritation.

> ...I was very annoyed at the time it was formed because I had pushed its formation as the University Christian Council rather than the University Church Council...this was done somewhere behind a lot of people's backs at the last moment.

Criticism was also forthcoming from local congregations; two of the ministers of large Berkeley churches were highly critical of the UCC's "mainline" composition. As one indicated, "To come to the point, an ecumenical expression of the church on a campus may, in my judgment, be very sectarian"; the UCC was seen as unwilling to give differing theological positions adequate consideration. "I think that the ecumenical mentality of groups like the UCC tends to be very defensive." Cited particularly by this parish pastor was the non-affiliation of denominations "like the Baptists,"

---

their own group." A younger member of the staff indicated what may be an implicit counter by insisting that "I really do not feel, in any meaningful sense, a part of the campus ministry. I think we do different things.... We're not a Protestant sect."

which illustrates the complexity and dilemmas of cooperation; Johnson's non-involvement in the UCC seems more reasonably explained by his own unwillingness than by conscious attempts at exclusion by others. As he stated:

> They [the Baptist State Convention] would very much frown on the idea because the UCC, you see, even though it is not an organic union, certainly has the purpose of heading toward organic union and its basic philosophy itself would be ecumenical. So even if I were disposed to belong, which I am not, they would not like that. The general consensus about Southern Baptists, although you really can't generalize about Baptists, but generally from what you read and the general tenor of conventions and things is that at this time we're not predisposed toward organic union, as you probably call it.

The issue remains open within the UCC. Porter's response reflects the tension present.

> Well, let's put it this way: a continuing invitation is open to any group that would wish to become a part of it...at the same time, none of us is willing to endanger the movement of the UCC together in the common witness in order to have a broader base. Now this is just a decision that we have to make. So I hope we can carry on conversations all along the board, but sometimes we get frustrated, sometimes they do, so I don't know....

Several interesting program elements have emerged from this structure, the most notable being a ministry to foreign students, of which there were nearly 3,000 in the fall of 1964. This endeavor employs a "full-time staff person" and has created its own structures, seeking to "welcome into the ministry of our congregations, our campus centers, and the University Church Council...the full participation of Christians from all countries."[8] Operating from a wide base of support, and at least minimally involving other groups (most noticeably Catholic and Southern Baptist) in its concerns, the director for this program is probably correct in his impression that it is the most ecumenical ministry at California, regardless of how the term be defined.

---

[8] The International Christian Ministry at the University of California at Berkeley, p. 1.

Such was the state, in cursory outline, of Berkeley's "mainline" Protestant campus ministry--pre-1964. Its efficacy, or lack thereof, in the face of crisis shall engage these remaining pages.

CHAPTER FOUR

DAYS OF CRISIS

> The most important thing is to make this campus a market place for ideas. But the University is trying to prevent the exposure of any new creative political solutions to the problems that every American realizes are facing this society in the mid-Sixties.
>
> Arthur Goldberg, Free Speech Movement leader

> This is not a matter of freedom of speech on the campuses.... This is purely and simply an attempt on the part of the students to use the campuses of the University unlawfully.... This will not be tolerated. We must have--and will continue to have--law and order on our campuses.
>
> Edmund G. Brown, Governor of the State of California

These statements, spoken in response to the same set of events, illustrate the major question of this study. Men respond to situations, but in so doing, value-orientations provide a perceptive framework in which events are read, in which facts are coherently related. Value-orientations, writes Parsons, "give reasons why one direction of choice rather than its alternative should be selected, why it is right and proper that this should be so."[1] Governor Brown's dilemma is apparent; the overwhelming, intense nature of the California crisis which inescapably and deeply involved him severely jarred the easy compatibility he had once seen between student protest and social problems, and his action throughout the crisis seems clearly premised upon perceptions and facts given importance and interpretation very different from those one sees in Arthur Goldberg.[2] Campus ministers also act in response to the situation and selective perceptions are apparent; what is vital to one is minimized by another; action deemed essential by some is vigorously opposed by colleagues. In this chapter, the task is descriptive. As noted previously, several campus ministers actively sought involvement with the constituent elements comprising this "explosion unprecedented in American higher education" and an account of that participation is an important piece in the larger mosaic. It is, further, the record of what men *did*, as opposed to what men say they *might* or *would* do, and affords the basis of our further inquiry, *why*, and what does it mean?

---

[1] Talcott Parsons, The Social System, p. 351.

[2] Governor Brown had rather expansively noted in 1961 that "here is an honorable source of college spirit.... I say: thank God for the spectacle of students picketing--even when...I think they are wrong.... At last we're getting somewhere.... For a while it will be hard on us administrators.... If America is still on the way up, it will welcome this new, important critical crop of young gadflies...." From his "Commencement Address" at the University of Santa Clara, June, 1961. Quoted in Saturday Review, January

It began quietly enough; a letter from the Office of the Dean, dated 14 September, 1964, officially closed a strip of sidewalk immediately adjacent to the campus which had for many years served a "Hyde Park" function, a forum from which student opinion might issue and funds be solicited for a variety of student protests and actions.[3] The sidewalk, it seems, belonged to the university after all (many had assumed it to be city property) and "Provisions of the policy of the Regents concerning 'Use of University Facilities' [would] be strictly enforced in all areas designated as property of the Regents...."[4] Designed to curb student political activity, and almost certainly written under pressure from outside partisan political interests, this letter fell as a spark into the highly combustible atmosphere

---

16, 1965, p. 66. Needless to indicate, the FSM found this to be a key example in their charge of hypocrisy.

[3] James Cass, for example, indicates it had been "an outlet for the social and political conscience of the campus community." "What Happened at Berkeley," *ibid*., p. 47.

[4] From the Dean's letter, quoted in *California Monthly*, *op*. *cit*., p. 35. The letter further states that the Regent's policies specifically forbid use of university facilities for "supporting or opposing particular candidates in...national elections." *Ibid*.

of the Berkeley scene.[5] "I received a copy of the Dean's notification," said one campus minister, "but...I filed this report; you know, I didn't see the implications that were involved in it at all...."

Nor, apparently, did anyone else. As a member of the Dean's office admitted, "None of us really realized that this would catch on...," an admission which may reflect the considerable distance which many observers believe existed between students and administration at that point. Berkeley's long history of student activism was apparently forgotten amid the more pressing and immediate issues.[6] Perhaps more precisely, most campus ministers saw little direct relevance in the order; it did not appear to infringe upon activities in which religious groups normally participated. The question was raised at a University Church Council-sponsored retreat in session when the letter was announced, but other considerations were recalled by participants as more primary, most notably "a long wrangle about whether or not we should take a stand as the University Church Council on the housing amendment, number 14." A letter questioning the wisdom of the closing was deferred, largely to accommodate Nishi. As a friend of Dean of Students Catherine Towle, he felt an individual, personal contact a more fitting, perhaps more productive manner of proceeding. This meeting took place, on the reasonable but incorrect assumption that since Dean Towle had issued the order, she had the power to rescind it. While this question was not broached directly, Nishi "sensed" that she had ordered the ban only under duress and had no real power to alter the decision. He recalls this luncheon engagement as largely "informational" in nature, a result somewhat less than what his colleagues expected. Nor was the meeting reported back in any formal way; events simply moved with greater rapidity than anyone was prepared to meet.

---

[5] Blame for such pressure is usually laid at the doorstep of William Knowland, publisher of the Oakland Tribune and manager of Senator Barry Goldwater's California effort. Support for Governor William Scranton had been much in evidence among students during the Republican National Convention, and Knowland's paper was picketed three consecutive Fridays preceding the order.

[6] See Max Heirich and Sam Kaplan, "Yesterday's Discord," in Lipset and Wolin, op. cit., pp. 10-35. The attraction of Berkeley to "young people with activist yearnings" this account describes provides new poignancy to Wolin and Schaar's prophetic comment that "the word has gone out: things are happening at Berkeley.... The events of last fall...will increase this magnetic attraction." Sheldon S. Wolin and John H. Schaar, "A Special Supplement: Berkeley and the Fate of the Multiversity," The New York Review of Books, March 11, 1965, p. 18.

In response to the question, "When were you first aware that something of an extraordinary nature was occurring at the University?", every campus minister cited "The Police Car," that bizarre thirty hours when several hundred students held captive in front of the main administration building, Sproul Hall, a police car sent on campus to remove an individual arrested for manning an illegal table. As this episode moved into the evening of October 1st and the morning of the 2nd, tensions between those comprising the surrounding group and another gathering of students hostile to this action and wishing to see the police car freed, "threatened to erupt into a full-blown riot," as a reporter of the scene recalled; here occurred one of the more visible and widely known incidents involving the campus ministry. Following several unsuccessful pleas by other individuals for peace and order, Father James Fisher of Newman Hall mounted the police car at approximately 1:30 a.m. and persuaded the would-be freers of the vehicle to disperse.[7]

Among the several commissions provided for in the organizational structure of the UCC is that of Community Affairs,[8] a co-chairman of which was Chamberlain. On the afternoon of the 1st, as the sit-in on campus became an obviously determined effort, this Commission had met to discuss it, deciding to meet again the following morning, again at Westminster House. As Chamberlain indicated:

---

[7] When queried regarding his efficacy in the face of failure by those who went before, Father Fisher (one must keep in mind the clerical collar and other highly visible religious garb) is reported to have said, "Everyone is a little superstitious."

> At the end of our meeting we decided that we should really to something about this free speech controversy--take a position on it. We decided to come back the next morning with some preliminary drafts of the kind of statement we'd make.

At the same time a meeting of the Interfaith Staff Workers was also called for that morning, although it is not now clear who issued this call.

Through the efforts of Joseph Gumbiner of Hillel Foundation--"he's been here ten years, is an older guy and so he has these relationships"--a group of six ministers and one student left this gathering at 10:30, spending two hours with Dean Towle and Dean of Students Arleigh Williams. It is here that several campus ministers first begin to doubt the administration's ability to correctly discern what was vitally at state. "Dean Towle, bless her soul...tried to tell us there's not a problem with free speech at all--that's simply out of the question." Then what was the problem? "The problem was one of authority, of who obeys the laws and who runs the campus...so the meeting ended fruitlessly."

This group returned to Westminster House and to other colleagues still arguing "about the theological position of being involved and taking stands." Several events occurred that afternoon. Leadership of the FSM, including Mario Savio, apparently impressed with the performance of Father Fisher much earlier that morning, had made an appearance seeking a presence at the still-surrounded police car of campus clergy, including clerical collars where possible. Given a sympathetic hearing, this meeting established the first contact through which the FSM found "moral support" and a place to meet throughout the months following. In an effort to free the police car and restore order to the campus, President Clark Kerr had agreed to meet with student representatives, and the Interfaith group, having concluded that issues of speech and advocacy on campus might well affect them after all, asked for and received permission to send a student to this caucus. It was further decided that Porter would accompany him ("because I talk the most"), although no assurance had been received that Porter would be admitted to the deliberations. Additionally, Porter was to carry with him a statement by the campus ministry supporting the objectives, while questioning the means used to obtain them, of the student demonstrators. That statement's preparation is best described by Herbert:

---

[8] "...concerned with the social, political and economic issues and problems in the campus, local, and national communities." A Statement of Purpose and Structure of the UCC, p. 3.

> We spent the whole afternoon trying to draft a statement but everybody had to do his little bit. We'd get a wording that would do and then five new people would walk in and 'oh, no, we can't have that.' One local minister just wandered in...and he had to have his say on the thing....

The statement was finally prepared and Porter was admitted to the ensuing meeting, though it was never formally presented. Porter's presence at this first real encounter between the demonstrating student faction and the university's administrative officers is unique; his position was largely that of interested observer placed between the two contestants--President Kerr and Chancellor Strong confronted by perhaps a dozen students--and he took little active part in the discussions.

> It was very much like a labor-management bargaining situation. It was carried out with the students demanding certainties that the things the president said would be carried out, with the president accepting certain revisions of statements that had been made and accepting the phraseology and the students questioning the meaning of the phraseology and rewriting the statements, and so on. It was very much like an oppo-

> nent agreement--writing a truce. This was disturbing to me initially because I didn't see the relationship between students and administration being one of opponents, but rather as reasonable people who were sitting down trying to figure out a problem.[9]

Throughout the entire controversy, student leaders were fond of asserting that "You can't trust anyone over thirty." This was never universally applied, however, and one of the significant exceptions, we have noted, was a number of campus ministers. At one point in the above bargaining session with the university, student leaders requested both Kerr and Strong to absent themselves while a caucus took place; Porter's right to remain was questioned by a student, only to have Savio declare him welcome. As Porter later stated, "It was an interesting experience to me because what it said was that the student demonstrators were not identifying the campus religious workers with the power structure but were saying in a sense that the religious workers and the religious groups were a part of the demonstration." During the ensuing discussion he raised a number of questions but to little effect. "...the level on which I was thinking and the questions I was raising to them had in a sense already been discussed by the students to the point where they had already decided their particular approach.... I still trusted the administration and they didn't." Out of this meeting came a series of propositions which were to serve as the basis for settlement and most observers assumed that the issues had been met and the crisis was over.[10] Savio stood atop the "flattened roof of the police car" that evening and after reading the agreement's provisions, said, "Let us agree by acclamation to accept this document. I ask you to rise quietly and with dignity, and go home."[11]

---

[9] This statement has significance, in part because it reflects a conception of the university implicit in several of the ministers in this study, as well as various publications now in print. Based upon "a community of scholars" image, in which each of the community's members becomes a "seeker after truth," administrators are equated with housekeeping, and the corporate aspects of a modern university are treated as an undesirable intrusion. That this image inadequately handles the "multiversity" is not apparent to many.

[10] The curious on-again, off-again character of the fall's events are illustrated here. As one local pastor of a prominent church indicated, an

Several aspects important to the question at hand are immediately evident:

1. Campus ministers were involved early in the crisis. Even those who demonstrated considerable doubt about the extreme methods (as interpreted by them) appear to have been generally supportive of the student wish to be heard, to have the arbitrary action implemented by the Dean's letter reconsidered. Haltingly, perhaps, on the part of some, but they were involved.

2. As a group, campus religious workers were perceived by the demonstration's student leadership to be generally supportive, hence to be trusted. This does not appear to have been true of any other "over thirty" group.

3. Trusting the administration, the campus ministers in this study assumed that the October 2 accord would close the matter. As Herbert recalled, "I thought, well, the olive branch has been offered both ways, they've come to an agreement and now they've got a way of settling the

---

organized effort toward reconciliation by community ministers was difficult; "I don't think anyone knew that the revolt was going to continue.... Had there been an awareness of how long this would continue or how deep the problem was, I think there would have been more consultation on a larger basis."

[11] The tension and concern of October 2nd was very evident in each of the ministers I studied. During the later hours of that afternoon, some five hundred local and state police had converged upon the university and as one religious worker recalled, "You cannot imagine the feeling we had when seeing this huge column of police, four abreast, march down Bancroft and onto the campus." When word of the massed police was received at the meeting in Westminster House, "we broke our meeting and ran, to get there first."

thing." It was a reasonable assumption, shared by nearly everyone. To quote the agreement, "discussions and hearing into all aspects of political behavior on campus and its control" and the question of "the duration of the suspension of the suspended students," generally considered to be the central problems, were provided for.[12]

Campus religious workers, we have previously noted, perceive definitional clues as to role from numerous sources within the diverse levels of the church, not the least of which is the local parish. And as these clues prove incompatible with other facets of one's self-definition, tension (and annoyance) result. During the early afternoon hours of the 2nd, Savio announced from the police car roof, almost incidentally, according to one account, that support for the student cause had been forthcoming from several campus ministers. This remark was overheard by a passing cleric from a large mainline congregation adjacent to the campus who, through his secretary, called the university denominational representative "to see what he was up to." While of little direct consequence, it suggests another important element in those pressures which impinge upon the campus ministry. After returning the local pastor's call:

> I really felt a bit threatened at that point.... I said to myself afterward, you know, it's fine to call him and inform him, he has a right to know; I guess I was overconcerned...he is not my superior, he does not call me and tell me how he handles his job.... It's amazing what people are perfectly happy with the assumption that they can tell us what to do.

The crisis, of course, was not over; on the contrary, the university's principal administrators seemed intent throughout the fall and winter months to provide every possible provocation. A faculty committee expected to exercise jurisdiction over student suspensions was, in reality, non-existent; the committee expected to discuss political behavior was unilaterally appointed by President Kerr with two places on it, out of twelve, going to representatives of the demonstrating group. Why not? As Kerr explained to a group in San Diego the evening of October 8, the whole affair consisted of "one episode--a single campus, a small minority of students, a short period of time."[13]

---

[12] Chamberlain's laconic reaction: "It was a typical civil-rights type solution; you call off your demonstrators, we'll set up a committee."

Throughout the weeks of confusion, force, counter-force, suspicion, tension and doubt following, the campus ministers in this study recall demands imposed from many sources. Each was committed to denominational programming requiring attention and time. Neither the Interfaith Staff Workers nor the UCC provided an adequate vehicle through which much-needed information and coordinated action might be channeled, hence statements issued in the campus ministry's name were highly ad hoc and the signatories vary somewhat from one to the next. Likewise, those ministers "reactive" in the typology invoke the spectre of a partisanship not deemed advisable in the given circumstances. Thus Johnson studiously avoided participation at any point and Nishi, following his early luncheon encounter with Dean Towle, provided a rather negative voice of caution and inaction. Predictably, the FSM received less than cordial receptions throughout much of the academic community and many of its most pressing needs were also its most prosaic. Where, for example, to hold the interminable series of meetings at which policy and strategy were hammered out? Policies governing the use of facilities and buildings vary from one denominational foundation to the next and although most were then actively seeking to implement an open door policy--most notably the Lutheran Center and Plymouth House--several of these were not available.[14] Only Wesley Foundation and Hillel shared the substantial effort required at this point with Westminster House where, it has been estimated, "well over half of the FSM's meetings were carried on."

---

[13] Quoted in California Monthly, op. cit., p. 46.

Other concerns also impinged upon the campus ministry, and illustrate the problems of cooperative action. We have already noted the fuzzy nature of concepts like ecumenicity when used in contexts where presumed concensus of meaning is in fact limited. Global ecumenism is, as Gustafson somewhere points out, safe enough, but its reality in the ongoing affairs of ordinary men seems more questionable. The State of California in the fall of 1964 had to confront not only the presidentical election theatrics but also the savage campaign waged over innocuous-sounding Proposition 14, a proposed amendment to the state constitution designed to nullify "open housing" laws and statutes. Acting individually, several campus ministers took part through the late summer and early fall in various efforts designed to secure the proposition's defeat. Such interest then led to a collective expression through the Interfaith Staff Workers, Father Fisher agreeing to author a statement for others to sign. Presented at a late October meeting, the resulting dismay and confusion seems evident in Gelwick's reflection:

> I said I was as much opposed to that statement as I was to Proposition 14 because the statement to me represented the worst form of theological statement that we could make.... It was in the sylogistic, propositional form that racial discrimination is a sin, that no man has the right to commit sin against God and that we as your shepherds, as pastors feel obliged to warn you that you stand in grave mortal danger of eternal hell or something.... It did say 'we warn you of the danger of losing your soul.' I felt that that statement had its own problems of alienation and that the students would not regard it as effective.... It made

---

[14] This included the YMCA. Not officially closed--it really could not be, given its long and distinguished history of an open door policy--FSM spokesmen insist that various Y staff members made little effort to conceal hostile attitudes and permission to meet a second time was not sought.

> me feel that I was somehow being uncharitable to attack a statement of a Roman Catholic.

He was not alone. All Protestants interviewed expressed grave reservations regarding the framework and language of the plea. "It represented more or less our basic conviction, but it didn't convey what we wanted to convey, say what we wanted to say," said one. High regard for Father Fisher only seems to have underscored their sense of frustration; efforts at drawing a counter-statement came to naught and the decision to finally sign, or not, was not easy.

> We didn't want to quibble about wording because we'd had so much experience, you know, quibbling about wording and not getting anywhere...finally, after a good deal of soul-searching, most of us signed it.

> There are times you have to decide you're not going to join; you can't debate theology forever, you know.... I preferred not to identify myself with the statement.

Once adopted, contributions were solicited from members of the Interfaith Staff Workers, and it appeared in the student newspaper, The Daily Californian, during October, 1964.

This incident seems revealing for at least two reasons. First, the almost total lack of meaningful structure through which diverse belief, attitude, and perceived facts might be discussed and assessed is highly apparent. Throughout the entire crisis, response remained largely an ad hoc affair, dependent upon particular individuals who, at irregular intervals, mustered support from those closest at hand for such events or statements as seemed then uppermost. Further, no system existed, nor was one forthcoming, which could expedite the mechanical matters involved--the reproduction of statements, their distribution, the collection of special funds, etc. Second, ecumenicity at the level of doing involves not only agreement concerning ends (all sincerely desired the defeat of Proposition 14) but the further question of tactics. The issue becomes the language in which religious convictions may be cast as one seeks to address and influence the world "out there." The "Thomistic, sylogistic form" which Father Fisher's statement took involved problems of form and language based upon differing conceptions of religious discourse; but further, each campus minister involved felt constrained to consider the statement in the light of his immediate student constituencies and beyond this group, the larger campus context to which the statement was finally directed. In this particular instance, lack of the former--adequate structure through which means for full discussion are provided--seems certainly to have contributed significantly to the latter--a statement whose usefulness and propriety, given its intended audience, remained very much in doubt for Protestant campus ministers.

As the weird events of October unfolded, the different courses pursued by these men, who by virtue of their active part in them we have categorized supportive in the typology, begins to emerge. At the same time, overt behavior distinguishing them from our middle range also becomes apparent. Immediately following The Police Car, use of Westminster House by the FSM occurred with regularity, Chamberlain often in attendance. "...nobody ever gave me any static. Mario or somebody would always say, when they had the credentials check, that I was OK." While not participants, he and several other campus ministers also observed numerous sessions of the administration-student-faculty Study Committee on Campus Political Activity. Laboriously brought into being after the October 2 agreement, it staggered through three weeks of heated hearings, finally collapsing from its own inner confusion and lack of trust. As one of those observers, Porter remembered:

> ...we began to get a sense of hopelessness as the sides in the matter began to congeal and to set themselves forward. We were very disap-

> pointed with the participation of the administrative representatives on the committee that was trying to iron out new rules, primarily, I think, because they would not enter into the conversation in a spirit of give and take and discussion. They sat there listening to the conversation between the faculty and the students and when they came to any kind of an understanding and would say, 'fine, this is a good idea,' then the administration's representatives would speak up and say 'we can't accept that.' So, in a sense, they placed themselves outside of the committee's discussion.

Clearly, these campus ministers sensed very early that discussion of the issues which had brought about the crisis was being subordinated to the issue of law and order and that neither of the major contestants seemed genuinely interested in compromise.[15] The crucial tasks, thus, were interpretation and, if possible, a reconciliation of these opposing forces, and to this end, several meetings were scheduled between campus ministers and representatives of the Dean's office. These were largely inconclusive, for reasons suggested by Porter:

> Our feeling as we came away from these meetings was that the people in the Dean's office really did not understand the basic issues but were trying to figure out 'how can we get the students to abide by the rules?' So the question is 'What are we doing wrong?' in the light of the fact that students don't obey the rules, not 'How are the rules wrong?', or 'In what sense are we failing in our task as deans?'

Again, two facts should be noted. At no time throughout these efforts were more than five or six campus religious workers, of the thirty-odd who so identify themselves, directly involved, even peripherally. Further, up to this point contacts with the university's administration occurred only at the Dean's-office level; the campus ministry lacked meaningful contact with the chancellor or the university president; also, as several later admitted, "it took a long time for us to realize that the students were right when they said, 'look, the Dean's office is nothing. You don't get any change at that point. You've got to go higher up.'"

---

[15] For good reason: Art Goldberg: "We ask only the right to say what we feel when we feel like it. We'll continue to fight for this freedom, and we won't quit until we've won." Chancellor Strong: "The University is a champion...of orderly and responsible conduct. It cannot and will not tolerate deliberate violations of its rules and regulations."

After the Committee on Campus Political Activity was formally dissolved through a communication issued jointly on November 9 by Chancellor Strong and President Kerr, a group of younger faculty members also realized that real catastrophe might well be at hand. Chamberlain sat with this group--a close friend was a key figure in it--as it drafted a proposal designed to provide a basis for resolving the deadlock, and he accompanied two of its representatives (one of whom was the mentioned friend) to a midnight session of the FSM's steering committee.

> The initial response was kind of bad. Mario was very tired and obviously it wasn't all the students were asking for. Weissman [another FSM leader] stayed up about five hours with us and discussed it. He was sufficiently impressed that they decided to think it over some more themselves and then present it to the Executive Committee....[16]

While no evidence exists that Kerr did more than merely receive this proposal (he clearly did not himself act upon it nor, apparently, was it passed on to the Board of Regents), Chamberlain's role as a mediator between faculty and demonstrators seems illustrative of the confidence he enjoyed from both groups.

Herbert had, in the meantime, learned of a graduate student study which was tracing a history of administrative attitudes toward student groups. "This is exactly what I wanted, you know; I'd been here a year and a half...it's very hard to understand why people are behaving the way they're behaving on all sides...you've been in school a long time but you've never heard of anything like this...so I said 'fine'...." Though he was not then acquainted with the people involved, Herbert attended one of the group's meeting; mutual admiration appears to have manifest itself quickly.

---

[16] The FSM, as originally constituted, consisted of fifty five representatives from a very wide spectrum of concerned student groups on the campus (three of whom were from the religious centers--Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish). From this policy-making body, or Executive Committee, eleven individuals were selected as a Steering Committee, charged with implementation of policy.

> ...I said,'well, it seems to me you've got a pair of possibilities. One is to write a diatribe...the other is to write an objective job...with some restraint, going only as far as the facts will take you, which is pretty darn far...'; as things worked out, they decided to do as I suggested.

Herbert also admits to having "polished up the prose a little bit" in the finished document. This fortuitous encounter was important; his already wavering belief in the administration's comprehension of what was central to the crisis and its willingness to negotiate in a spirit of compromise was now placed in an historical context; Herbert believed a pattern of "duplicity" was clearly discernible. At the same time, his image of the FSM "type" was substantially rearranged.

> In the process of working with these people my feeling for their conscientiousness was considerably enhanced; I thought the fact that they would do this study was an important and impressive thing. It was evident from the conversations we were having that these people were very sensitive to the kinds of things that have been of concern to me here at Berkeley...and it was out of these contacts that I was able to sharpen my impressions of certain characteristics of this insurgent group to the point where I was able to talk to the people of the Dean's staff who came here....[17]

Herbert first met Mario Savio (apart from the group encounter October 2) on the 10th of November during the large-scale manning of tables in front of Sproul Hall which followed the Political Activity Committee's collapse. As he recalled; "I walked up to him and said, 'I suppose you have been exposed to all possible arguments, although this isn't a very good time to do this,' and he said, 'I think it's a great time and I haven't been exposed to all arguments.'" Later that day, they met again, coincidentally, at Westminster House. Savio had "seemed sort of friendly and open," hence another invitation to conversation was offered and accepted; they went for a walk.

---

[17] One of the more vivid impressions retained by Herbert from these several encounters with the Dean's staff was a comment by one who "urged us to keep out of politics, because the church fares much better when it stays out of politics, and the two modern churchmen who...we should take for our examples were Tillich and Bonhoeffer." Herbert found this, predictably, a peculiar reading of Bonhoeffer.

> ...you are accepting Clark Kerr's metaphor about what a university is; you are saying, 'we'll see it as a factory and we'll fight like labor people within a factory structure'; you are conceiving yourselves as Clark Kerr conceives you. And I said, 'it seems to me that this does violence to the idea of the university which stands above both yours and Kerr's, and that is the idea of some sort of community of people who are concerned for learning,' and I said, 'I think that before any agreement between you and the administration will hold water at all, some sort of basis for mutual trust will have to exist. Otherwise, you'll always be afraid of betrayals.... And so this trust has got to exist but you are so legal-minded and have such a great concern for getting things down on paper right....'
>
> Well, I expected that these words would fall on completely deaf ears, but by no means was that true. He knew exactly what I was talking about and the conversation was simply delightful. You know how these things are; you run across someone who is just so bright and so vivacious and so much fun to talk to and so clearly in command of his thoughts, and furthermore, he seems very personable to me.... He's got a kind of warm humorousness.... And I said, 'you know, there's something in this whole business that goes a long way beyond anything political,' and he said, 'there sure is...you've got to distinguish between levels of motivation and those of explicit struggle. On the level of motivation,' he said, 'it's a battle of alienation, about not feeling a part,' and he went into this business about The Stranger...and the accused sits there thinking, 'this is kind of funny because this doesn't seem to have much to do with me, it's their thing, but they seem to know what they're doing...,' and he said, 'this is exactly the feeling we get at these administrative committees....'

This conversation suggests several considerations. The FSM became for Herbert a personality, an individual with whom resonance on fundamental issues is clearly apparent and immediate. Trust and a reciprocated admiration also follow readily; the conflict becomes not only that of two contending forces, each seeking the other's surrender, but rather, human beings with whom one may suffer and commiserate. Secondly, as this trust developed, it provides the basis for a qualitatively differing support. Use of facilities, a willingness to engage in debate, etc.--these we have seen previously. But as Porter recalled:

> There were so many strong personalities involved in that group [the FSM Exeuctive Committee] that I could raise all kinds of questions and make all kinds of comments and I would simply be outvoted or be shunted to one side and they would go ahead and make decisions on their own.

As we shall see, Herbert meets this question and moves beyond a position of debate to one of partisanship.[18] Thirdly, one notes that this encounter marks Herbert's movement onto the scene as a major participant. Co-extensive with his increasing support is a renewed effort at interpretation moving from the level of university dean to university president.

Another encounter of interest should be noted here before leaving November 10; Porter and Herbert "sort of wandered up to the Dean's office to talk to Arleigh Williams or anybody else who wanted somebody to talk to." Herbert here met university vice-president Earl Boulten for the first time. "He wanted, to put it bluntly, to split the religious groups off from the FSM" but "we said we didn't think that was a very interesting topic of conversation." In the ensuing discussion, Herbert recalled stressing again the need for a common basis of trust.

> I said, 'Look, this has more and more the appearance of a Greek tragedy; it's imperative we cut beyond our differences to some common humanity whereby we can resolve these conflicts....' I argued very vehemently with him, that we must get out of this vicious circle. And the only way was for somebody--for example, the administration--to take the initiative...to do something which would show certain respect for the student, show a certain understanding of the justifiability of the grievances.... I said, 'You've got this picture in your mind of a bunch of wild-haired, irresponsible beatnick-type people and you're not thinking about human beings, you're thinking about what I think.' This went on for some length.

---

[18] As one of Herbert's colleagues suggested, "He was so trusted that the Steering Committee met over at his house a number of times." This was meant, apparently, as an accolade.

Boulton took notes throughout this conversation, and several days later, after President Kerr had issued a prepared press statement, called Herbert to University Hall.[19] "Now there was a lot of you in that" Herbert remembered him saying; "I felt relevant as all get out."

Following his highly satisfying walk with Savio, Herbert had occasion to relate many of the impressions formed to an individual on Kerr's staff who, in turn, suggested they be communicated to Kerr by letter. Herbert did this; he likewise gave a copy to Savio. When read at a meeting of the Steering Committee, "they clapped and cheered...it was the first time that anybody outside their immediate circle had looked in and said, 'This is something real....'" "From then on," he noted, "I was welcome anytime, anyplace." At the FSM's urging, permission was sought from Kerr allowing the letter's publication. When this was not forthcoming, Herbert readdressed it, expanded several portions, and paid for its appearance in the November 19th issue of The Daily Californian, the first of several public expressions of which he is the only or principal author.

Amid the glow of "our sense of being humane people," Herbert and Boulton explored during their November 13 meeting further contacts with members of the FSM.

> 'Look,' I said, 'why don't we have a meeting; I'll get some people from the FSM and you can come and we'll just talk about what's on our minds, we'll get a clearer picture of what the issues really are, what's important and what isn't, so that we won't have this business of nobody knowing, people running back and forth and round and round in their own circles but really not having any contact with the other side.' 'Oh, fine,' he said, 'that's just grand; let's do that.' So I set the meeting up for Monday....

Monday, the 16th, arrived, but Mr. Boulton did not. Very much concerned lest the meeting become common knowledge or be construed by any of its participants as official or binding, he finally refused to come at all after learning that one of the FSM representatives was a non-student.[20] The second participant in this abortive effort then spoke to Boulton; "He took the phone and they talked and talked and talked...then they agreed between themselves that I could be an intermediary; if there was anything that one side wanted to say to the other, they could say it through me." Herbert visited Boulton's office later that day.

---

[19] This building, adjacent to the Berkeley campus, houses the administrative offices for the entire university system.

> I was furious. We had a little exchange and I sort of firmed up this agreement to go back and forth this way, which I proceeded to do. I guess that began about the 16th or so, and continued right up to the Regent's meeting. That history is a great jumble of details of one sort or another.

The spectacle is a sorry one. Two inflexible, contending forces, neither of which find real discussion, much less negotiation, with the other possible. In this explosive atmosphere, nearly everyone looked to the November 20 meeting of the University's Board of Regents where the whole controversy was presumably being given priority attention. Many feared, including Herbert, that further overt student demonstrations could only foreclose sympathetic consideration and his concern was to insure that both contenders were cognizant of the other's daily intent and action, that misinterpretation by one or the other did not destroy the minor semblances of balance then existing.

> The administration knew every morning, before the FSM stated it, what the FSM was going to do that day through me. I would just tell them, there is going to be a rally, these are the people who are going to speak, this is what they are going to speak about and there's going to be tables, this is what the score is, so that a situation wouldn't arise in which the administration would be excessively worried that they were going to sit in or something like that...so I kept calling University Hall...this is what's going on, that's what is going on....

What an amazing commentary on the collapse of communication; a campus minister was the only real link left.

---

[20] Jack Weinberg, the "non-student" arrested in the October 2nd Police Car Episode.

Sproul Hall's steps became the scene of a huge FSM rally ("more than three thousand") on the 20th as the Board of Regents prepared to meet at University Hall. Featuring Joan Baez and a calypso arrangement of the Lord's Prayer, it was, remembered Herbert (the only campus minister, apparently, in attendance), "a fantastic rally...simply overpowering, really beautiful...." This demonstration concluded with a march by the majority of those present to the spacious lawns directly across a major Berkeley thoroughfare from University Hall. It seems unlikely that any deliberative body could have formulated a set of policy statements wholly satisfactory to all, and the evidence suggests that the Regents did not really try. Presented by Kerr and Strong, six recommendations were discussed and approved as offered. These dealt in the main with reinstatement of suspended students for offenses committed prior to October 1 (this date is important, though was not generally so recognized at the moment), with more explicit rules, and with the need for additional staff for the Dean's office and the Police Department. Additionally, the Regents approved a guarded resolution permitting use of university facilities by students for planning and implementing "lawful off-campus action, not for unlawful off-campus action."[21] The FSM responded by calling a Steering Committee meeting, attended by Herbert. Porter, Chamberlain, Gelwick and Herbert reacted to the Regents' set of rulings in much the same fashion, for to each the implication seemed clear; the university meaned to determine before the act was committed what was legal or illegal, a procedure suggesting to these ministers the almost total misunderstanding of events thus far. Herbert particularly appears to have been disheartened and upset.

---

[21] As quoted in the California Monthly, op. cit., p. 57.

> At this point, my understanding of what I was doing in the situation shifted and became much less clear; whereas before I could see myself as a kind of mediator, it now became impossible to be...one could simply become a partisan, which I certainly did do to some degree.... I thought, 'There's nothing left for the Swiss legation to do but deliver a declaration of war....'

Commitment, however, has many levels and may take numerous forms. After considering open denunciation of the administration and urging massive student sit-ins, Herbert rejected this, an action which placed him with the Steering Committee's minority. This is likely the most demoralized period of the FSM's brief history. Reinstatement of suspended students and the promise of revised campus regulations seem to have produced enormous uncertainty about not only how but against whom and what to react and demonstrate. The scheduled Monday sit-in, decided only through acrimonious debate and the narrowest possible majority vote, was indeed the nadir.

It seemed readily apparent to most observers that the manner in which the Regent's directives were given explicit form by the Berkeley administration was of crucial importance. To this end, Porter performed a rather remarkable act by picking up the telephone on Sunday morning, the 22nd, calling Chancellor Strong, and urging an audience with him yet that same day. "He didn't really want to meet with us but felt maybe he should...." Thus, "that Sunday morning when we should have been in church," Porter, Chamberlain, Herbert and Gumbiner (Hillel) conversed with the Chancellor and Vice-chancellor in charge of student affairs, Alex Sherriffs. The perceptions these men retain of that encounter are highly similar; all were discouraged.

> We talked with him for a while and he was playing cat and mouse with us and refused to understand the basic issues about what the students called double jeopardy and prior jurisdiction—or he didn't understand it. I tend to think the latter, to think he's just a confused old man who was put under tremendous pressure in this job.
>
> As it turned out, even though he took some of the things we had to say

> into account, he didn't go far enough. And again the feeling that there was no introspection or no self-analysis or criticism involved on their part. It was a very defensive proposition so that all we could do in a sense was indirectly threaten by saying, 'Look, if you do this, the students are going to do that.' And they kept trying to say, 'Can't you convince the students not to?' Well, we didn't have any control over the students....

Here, too, the question of degree has importance. Herbert, as we have seen, and Chamberlain, as we shall see, move closer to student and faculty positions respectively by virtue of their deepening distrust of the administration. Porter does not shift quite so radically. "I felt that the rules and regulations as they came out after that meeting had hope in them, but they still did not deal specifically with all the issues...it may be that I still had a sense of naive optimism of the ability of people to sit down and iron things out." His role as an active participant diminishes from this point on until well into the spring.

On Sunday afternoon, Chamberlain, with two faculty friends, sought out the Steering Committee, reporting not only upon the above conversation but likewise presenting to them what came to be known as the Levine proposal, one of several faculty-prepared formulas designed to arbitrate the worsening conflict. Already present was Herbert; these two campus ministers then sat through the agonizing discussion and debate which finally culminated in the next day's abortive sit-in.

For abortive it was. Even as some three hundred students filled the halls of Sproul Hall on Monday afternoon, questions of purpose and tactics badly splintered the Steering Committee; again by a very close vote, dissolution of the sit-in was recommended, "a decision [which] met with dissent from many demonstrators," and the building was cleared before five o'clock that evening. "Monday evening, I guess it was, or maybe it was Tuesday, one of the members of the Steering Committee dropped me a note and asked

...'Would the Swiss legation chair a meeting of the Steering Committee?' ... All three of the major leaders...were really at each other's throats... this sit-in had split the FSM inside very badly." Herbert met one of the principals before the meeting, urging that he lay before the others the pent-up emotion and frustration which had, in large measure, precipitated the present internal crisis. "You hate his guts and you'd better let him know that."

> So I got to this meeting and what I did was to keep everybody else out of it, let them fight it out philosophically, and they did, for about an hour and a half...two very passionate people...and when that was settled,...[the third leader] walked in and pretty soon they were talking to each other and I left.
>
> I served this rather strange function, you see, of being a kind of neutral person, in a sense neutral but not really neutral, one that everybody could trust. I was chairing the meeting because they knew I wasn't partisan in that way, so, although I really didn't chair the meeting, I did conduct myself in a way, you know, which encouraged reconciliation among revolutionaries, but not between the revolution and the established order.... And that wasn't the last time something like that happened....

This incident is highly illustrative of Herbert's relationship to and understanding of the FSM and the crisis generally. That is, the relationship exists largely at the personal level, concerned deeply for the frustration and lack of purpose students professed to find in the Berkeley setting, for a deep-felt sense of gross injustice and injury to personhood. It was, to him, a distressing and profound sequence of events which seemed to defy rationality, and which crushed into meaninglessness individuality and genuine community. Emotion, an overwhelming feeling of helplessness--these become increasingly evident in both action and the reflection on it he commits to writing. Frequently a peculiar pattern of pastoral concern emerges in which Herbert listens to and shares with individual leaders of the FSM the weariness, self-doubts, anger and tensions largely hidden from public view, and his reflections on these moments contain much pathos and sympathy. Trust for campus ministers as a group not immediately and necessarily identified with the official university "power structure" was apparent, we have noted, very early in the sequence of things. Porter, Chamberlain, Gumbiner, Fisher, Gelwick, Nash, Jordon and Christiansen were individuals who refused to dismiss the FSM out of hand, and who acknowledged the presence of genuine and unresolved issues. None of these, however, relates to individuals within the FSM's structure on the basis of friendship and trust which Savio and Herbert appear to share reciprocally. One further incident portrays this vividly.

> When he [Savio] left town to go on this tour across the country, everyone was at war within the FSM and at each other's throats. I was called up at four in the morning; I was the only other person that everybody trusted, and at four o'clock in the morning I was down at FSM Central to settle one of these things. Well, one of the parties to the dispute got up and walked out and called New York. Mario called back--it was a very serious breach--...he called back and told everybody to do what I said and so there it was...and we settled it, by God, before seven o'clock.

On Tuesday, the 24th, Chancellor Strong clarified regulations and procedures applying to tables, soliciting funds, etc., and the Academic Senate[22] took under discussion the Levine proposal which Chamberlain had seen drafted and presented to the FSM.

> The Levine Proposal basically incorporated what was in the Resusky proposal and had some polemical remarks about outside interests intervening in our damn university, and it lost in the Academic Senate by a few votes, mainly because of some bad politics. People didn't understand that the body of the proposal was to be separated from the polemical preamble. They really should have dropped the preamble. That's when the faculty began to get wise politically and it got better from then on.

From this statement emerge those factors determining Chamberlain's typological position. His involvement at this point (and, as will become evident, increasingly so) is with the university's faculty or, more precisely, with a group of younger faculty seeking to mediate. He recognized, secondly, rather early in the crisis that only the faculty possessed sufficient status and influence to significantly challenge either student or administrative positions. This assessment proved to be, in the main, correct. Third, his analysis centers upon issues, upon proposals, upon groups as power blocks who move, counter, and nullify. This fundamental distinction, which separates two men otherwise deeply involved and committed, is illustrated with clarity in their respective reflections upon the meeting with Chancellor Strong; Herbert was struck with Strong's "repelling comments," his "incredible rudeness"; Chamberlain found him unwilling or unable to understand "what the students called double jeopardy and prior jurisdiction." Thus, Chamberlain demonstrates a constant interest in the pragmatic questions of purposeful strategy and daily tactics. One recognizes power; one also uses and manipulates such power as may be at one's disposal.

---

[22] The full faculty on the Berkeley campus.

"I have but one lamp," wrote Patrick Henry some time ago, "by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience." In the affairs of men, that lamp seems frequently a dim flame indeed. One of the more perplexing and illogical aspects of this period remains the inexplicable manner with which the administration managed, surely inadvertently, to rekindle student passion and protest when organized resistance threatened to collapse from general apathy or internal dissension.

Although the Levine proposal failed to carry a majority of the Academic Senate, faculty action was clearly imminent, and part of the FSM's leadership questioned the propriety of action which might further alienate professorial support. This and the Chancellor's procedural arrangements dealing with advocacy and solicitation seem to have convinced most casual observers that the FSM was left with no clear-cut enemy or cause. On Saturday, the 28th, during Thanksgiving recess, Chancellor Strong provided one, or at least refurbished the old; letters initiating disciplinary action for their part in organizing and sustaining events of October 1 and 2 were received by FSM leaders Savio and Goldberg. It is difficult to imagine an action the effect of which seems so predictable. As Lipset (no friend of the FSM) so wonderfully understates, "To many, this seemed an implicit violation of the signed agreement between the university and the student leaders that had brought the police-car episode to an end."[23] The FSM reacted immediately and escalation began in earnest.

"I sat and thought about the meaning of these letters," Herbert recalled, "and what I thought was that absolutely no justice could be done in the situation by the sort of tribunal that was going to try these things." Why the letters at this late date? Herbert thinks the magnitude of the FSM had even then not fully registered with either Regents or administration. Chamberlain pointedly agrees; "They refused to deal with issues on their own merits, you know. There was too much of 'these stupid, beatnick-like kids; you can't deal with them.'" An effort to reach President Kerr failed, as he was then in Washington, nor would anyone in his office communicate with the FSM's leadership. Herbert believes that Kerr ordered this. "That's a hell of a breakdown in communication...it was the kind of communication that could be remedied by picking up the telephone. Really, just a wall of sound." Collision at this point seemed inevitable by those closest to the crisis. Monday was a beautiful day, Herbert remembered, and "I walked around like Jeremiah, saying 'This is it!, this is it!' But nobody wanted to believe me."

> And you know, however weird this must sound on a peaceful morning the following spring, there was a terrific sense of tension, and it wasn't

---

[23] Seymour Lipset and Paul Seabury, "The Lesson of Berkeley," The Reporter, January 28, 1965, p. 38.

> just me.... Michael Rossman says, we didn't ask them to sit in on Tuesday or Wednesday, we stopped them from sitting in.... There was this terrific sense of something going to happen. And it did.

It certainly did. On Tuesday, December 1, the FSM issued an ultimatum demanding that disciplinary charges be dropped, that no further action be attempted, and that civil courts alone be permitted to determine and regulate the content of political speech. Refusal to honor this demand could only lead to "direct action." When the administration refused, Joan Baez climaxed a Wednesday rally (estimated to have drawn over six thousand students and faculty) by leading fifteen hundred into Sproul Hall. The famous sit-in was on. Chamberlain arrived late that night.

I went in there for an hour at one point to talk to some of our people.

And they let you?

> Well, yes, but only because I had Jim Fisher along with me; with his collar they said it was all right. And I met Joe Gumbiner who was just coming out. Joe had spent about an hour in there with them arguing, trying to tell them to get out, that they shouldn't do this. I was less sure that this was the wrong thing to do. You know, I wasn't encouraging them to do it, but I had said to them individually enough times, 'Go slow, go slow,' and I was psychologically in no position to tell them anything. So I didn't say anything. I just went in mainly to consult with the four students from Westminster House to make sure they knew what they were doing and a few other students I know. And because I wanted to find out what was going on.

What was going on outside Sproul Hall at that time was of more significance. By 2 a.m., over six hundred uniformed policemen had assembled; at 3:45 a.m., on Governor Brown's explicit order, and contrary to the wishes of Kerr and Strong, arrest of those inside was begun, a process requiring nearly twelve hours for completion. Chamberlain first became aware of this the next morning through a radio announcement.

> And of course I dropped whatever I had in my hand and ran right down to Westminster House and then over to the campus. Coming from Westminster House I ran into this huge group of police and I stood there and looked and some policeman came and said, 'Move on, buddy,' and I was very teed off at him...first they'd sealed off the route I take to work, and I didn't like his attitude.... While the arrests were going on Jim Fisher

> and I were trying to get in...we identified ourselves as campus ministers and we couldn't even get beyond the sergeant.... So one of the damaging things on the police side of it here is that neither faculty nor campus ministers were allowed in the building at all while the arrests were going on....

The consternation, anger and dismay this series of events provoked throughout the University seems at least partially evident in reactions which followed: students and faculty raised some $8500 toward required bail bonds for the 800 jailed; a general faculty meeting overwhelmingly declared support for liberalization of campus political activity rules; the Berkeley American Association of University Professors' Executive Committee requested Strong's dismissal and appointment of "a new chief campus officer who will have the confidence of the University community";[24] a telegram "strongly condemning the presence of the State Highway Patrol on the Berkeley campus" and signed by 361 faculty members was conveyed to Governor Brown; and the Graduate Co-ordinating Council set into motion its strike plan for the campus. This faculty session convened the afternoon of December 3, even as the last demonstrators were being carried from Sproul Hall, and Chamberlain attended. As he recalled,

> It was a sort of ad hoc group of faculty--I suppose maybe 1200 to 1500 showed up--and it passed three resolutions that were strongly anti-administration, you know, of off the top of their heads. The meeting was chaired in a remarkably disorganized way by Nat Glazer.

Chamberlain's presence here indicates again the easy manner in which he associated with various faculty groups.

The Interfaith Staff Workers met the following morning at Westminster House, where Herbert and Chamberlain outlined in some detail events of the preceding two days. "They didn't know," said Herbert, "what was going on.

---

[24] _California Monthly_, _op_. _cit_., p. 63.

Quite understandably, for events had broken very rapidly."[25] Their response took the form of a statement, prepared by Herbert and signed by eleven of those present, which essentially encouraged faculty action. It concluded with the following plea:

> I profoundly hope that the faculty of this campus will find itself capable of assuming this extremely difficult burden, and will do the desperately needed job of promoting freedom and justice for all.

This meeting and statement emphasize two aspects of campus ministry's situation we have previously seen: cooperation at what level, and the structure through which it may be implemented. Many campus ministers wished to be involved, to demonstrate relevance. But no concensus emerged, even among the willing. Gelwick seems particularly aware of the resulting semi-paralysis.

> I thought our participation at that point was effective for us [those events encompassed by the police car episode]. It helped us clarify, I think, certain things for ourselves. We at least had gotten involved. ... And we continued after that point for some time to try to formulate other statements and to continue this policy.... Later, we were one of the groups, one of the few, that made a statement to the effect that the faculty appeared to be the only agent that could provide a mediating role at the brink between the administration and the students. And we had made a statement to that effect and had it all ready to be presented at one of the largest rallies that ever occurred. This was the day after the mass arrests. And we were all ready, we had it mimeographed, here at Plymouth House. And I volunteered to do it that day--I was afraid we weren't going to have it...we had it ready by about 11 a.m., by leaving the meeting and coming on down here and getting it done.... We always had this problem, it seemed to me, of just almost not making the scene at all.

---

[25] This statement requires slight modification. At Westminster House, for example, the absence of several students then participating in the Sproul Hall sit-in deeply affected, according to Nash, those who remained, including herself. She also stated in reflection that "We were beginning that evening our study of Reinhold Niebuhr's Moral Man and Immoral Society, so the Collegium had their first study session with this book on the second floor of Sproul Hall...and the students found tremendous significance in this ancient [1932!] work.... We spent six weeks studying this book and using, as sort of an illustration, the very immediate situation, analyzing the situation in the light of Niebuhr." This rather extreme awareness of and involvement in almost certainly relates to Westminster's unique living arrangement and type of student thus attracted, as described in Chapter Two. This intimacy and closeness to events was not apparent at any other religious center studied.

Those campus ministers signing Herbert's statement anticipated a reading of it at the huge rally (estimated at five thousand) held that noon on the now familiar Sproul Hall steps, but it was not. Whether this was simply the pressure and confusion of numbers--numerous FSM leaders and faculty members appeared--or a deliberate downgrading of the campus ministry in the eyes of the rally's organizers, as charged by Gelwick, cannot, or at least was not, determined with certainty.

As one might suppose, that weekend is a jumbled history of public pleas for order and frantic behind the scenes maneuvering. Kerr announced on Sunday a special campus-wide convocation for Monday morning where he would introduce a proposal, unanimously approved by departmental chairmen, that would "innaugurate a new era of freedom under law." This is, in most chronologies, crisis event number three: The Greek Theatre. Kerr's presentation did not impress Porter.

> I was rather disappointed at Kerr's statement and at Scalipino's statement at this rally. I didn't feel that he said very much which spoke to the immediate issues. He talked more about the spirit of cooperation and the love of the university, and so on, which had very little substance as far as I was concerned. But it was enough substance, apparently, to begin to knock the wind out of the sails of the middle of the road people who were interested in the spirit of the university.... So I was fairly pessimistic when he got finished; he really hadn't accomplished anything.

However swayed the "middle of the road people" may have been at that moment, this was rendered mute by another classic administrative miscalculation; Savio tried to speak as the meeting adjourned, only to be bodily hauled by police from the stage in full view of 16,000 stunned onlookers. Herbert described the scene.

> Well, the place went up on its feet, it rose as one man, with a terrific 'noooo.' It was horrifying, crystalizing and dramatizing so clearly what had been going on all this time; Charter Day rhetoric with, you know, the police right behind it. I said to myself, 'We're going to have a riot.' There hadn't ever been one, you know, but I thought this would be the time.

Savio was finally permitted, after a frenzied interval of perhaps ten minutes, to announce an FSM rally which would, he said, be held immediately in front of Sproul Hall, where all would be allowed to speak. Herbert continued.

> At that moment, the moral authority of the administration was totally demolished; there was nothing left of it.... Kerr was finished...that was his last play. It was stupid to try and have a meeting like that, unless you were really going to give them the whole world, and it was even more stupid to have the police there. At that moment there was one man on the California campus whose word was law, and that was Mario Savio. No one would go home until he said the word...a really incredible situation had developed on the campus; a junior in philosophy had taken it over...for that half hour period.

Chamberlain reacted somewhat differently.

> Clark Kerr comes and thinks he's making a great concession by saying that as far as university action is concerned there will be amnesty for this, which is really no concession at all since they'll all have to stand trial in front of a vindictive public anyway. But Clark Kerr here as at every other point refused to deal with the issues. Just refused. And that's why I think he's a crummy administrator.

The question of Savio's treatment was raised.

> That was a real bit of brinksmanship on the part of the Free Speech Movement. Well, in any case, that [Kerr's proposal] was an utter failure and there was a meeting of the students...a huge rally...I suppose 10,000. And there was a counter meeting of Students for Law and Order or something like that....

Again, the different perspectives through which these two men perceive what is taking place is striking. Herbert casts his commentary almost solely in terms of the human element: the destruction of Kerr's "moral authority," "law" invested in Savio. Chamberlain, as noted previously, places primary emphasis upon the issues, the tactics involved, the interplay of two counterpoised student groups as they hold their respective and simultaneous rallies.

The following day, Tuesday, December 8, undoubtedly marks the FSM's finest hour. The Academic Senate, meeting in semi-public session (loudspeakers carried its deliberations to thousands of students gathered outside), adopted a five-point resolution which granted, in all essentials, the reasonableness of the FSM position. FSM response was almost immediate: "With deep gratitude the Free Speech Movement greets the action of the faculty. The passing of the proposals of the Academic Freedom Committee is an unprecedented victory for both students and faculty...the FSM will be completely at the service of the Committee...in its coming efforts to formulate proper regulations." The premature nature of their victory celebration did not become apparent for some time. Chamberlain's involvement with faculty deepens at this point.

> It was basically with a highly organized group of the 200 who had prepared the December 8 resolution, but I did a lot of public relations work with other people, too, between the Academic Senate meeting of December 8 and the December 18 meeting of the Board of Regents. And then after the December 18 meeting of the Regents which brought on the Christmas vacation and the disappointment on the part of the students, I met just about every day of Christmas vacation with Junior faculty people trying to do basically two things: 1) to get the emergency executive committee to insist on a clarifying position on the question of advocacy...and 2) to get the Academic Freedom Committee to come out with a workable set of rules by January 4 which would make it possible for certain realities to routinely exist like student rallies. Strong was in an unbelievable way, and looking for an incident, somebody to crack down on, with the blessings of some Regents. By this time I was pretty closely identified with Junior faculty people much more so than students although I never felt funny about going to a student meeting....

The influence exerted by Chamberlain in these fluid and rapidly-paced events cannot be discerned with any degree of accuracy, nor does this seem necessary for the purposes of this study. His conversation, his reflection upon and participation in the many tedious, often exasperating private debates through which policy was shaped for submission to the Academic Senate, authenticate his own perception of deep involvement; he was also so perceived by those with whom I spoke from the university's administration. Again, issues and strategy dominate his reflections.

There was another dimension of the crisis, present from the first confrontation, which no campus minister could completely ignore. "I've made a couple of speeches to citizens' groups," said Gelwick, "like the three hundred women who were here for a tea this spring sponsored by the auxiliary. I talked about the Free Speech Movement to this group, and the response was terrific." Even as part of their number sought an active, direct relationship to the immediate events, all were caught up in webs of discussion and interpretation spun by these events throughout the entire academic and local communities, of which Gelwick's statement provides example. Campus ministers, we have noted, serve constituencies composed largely of students. But the very fact of a ministry, its support by and dependency upon denominational structures, imposes upon them responsibilities to that structure and, by extension, all who make it up. Hence, with willingness or without, campus ministers were called upon to explain and clarify to these various interests the crisis and their role in it.

Herbert, for example, received a call from the program director of the Glide Foundation in San Francisco on December 8, even as the Academic Senate was debating its far-reaching resolutions. This organization, it will be remembered, funded the experimental ministry Herbert was conducting.

> He said, 'There's going to be a meeting of the board of directors of the Glide Foundation today and we thought you might be interested in coming over for lunch and telling us about what's happening at Cal. And the bishop will be there.' I got the word about this first through my wife and I thought to myself, oooooh. Well, okay, I'd be glad to, and I did. And what I did was tell them the story, beginning with the Regent's meeting, the whole thing, every scrap of insight...and they were just fascinated.

Were they critical of your role in the crisis?

> Not at all. But you see, they didn't have much of a chance. I was there for just a few minutes...no, that was not the reason I was called. But it had a very good effect. What I did was to tell them the story and to call the major shots; 'Watch what the Senate does,' and the Senate did very nicely.

This type of involvement ranges across our typology. Although Nishi refused to support his colleagues in their more overt and partisan action, he still found it expedient to gather a number of graduate students, whom he believed represented a wide spectrum of student opinion, several members of the faculty, and representatives "of the administration" which met weekly for "an extended period of two or three months." Likewise, Johnson, whose response was cast almost solely in negative terms and who professed to see no necessity for group discussion of the issues, still admitted private or casual conversation with students in which views were expressed and where influence might well be exerted. This need to interpret and explain moved upward into those levels of denominational structure to which the campus ministry looks for financial support and to which they owe at least a nominal deference. Likewise, as with Gelwick above, campus ministers addressed the local church level, where people interested in, often frightened and offended by, these strange and unprecedented events, looked to ministers for clarification. Appearances before formally organized groups or bodies,[26] informal conversation with local ministers and parishioners,[27] widely circulated flyers,[28] letters to national publications,[29] and articles appearing in opinion or denominational journals[30] are the modes of expression most frequently encountered. Nor does such interpretation flow outward only; in several instances, campus ministers were forced to explain comment originating in the local parishes which students considered irrelevant or extremely biased.[31]

---

[26] For example, a meeting involving twenty ministers and laymen of Berkeley Presbyterian churches, to which were invited Chamberlain, Herbert, a member of the Dean's staff, and a graduate student, took place while I was in California collecting data, and several significant facets of it are relevant here. Each minister presented at some length descriptive accounts of his own involvement throughout the preceding months and, predictably, Herbert placed much emphasis upon a broadly based "anger against the university" related to depersonalizing forces present there, and upon those "peculiarly human concerns" and "sensitivities" brought to this crisis by campus ministers. Chamberlain spoke largely of "sociological" factors: a new militancy characterizing student attitudes toward civil and economic injustice, and the university's rapid and disjointed growth. Of particular interest was the meeting's structure. In the role of chairman, Chamberlain sought questions from the group assembled, only to have the host minister continually "request" narrative from the four panelists. Nor did the increasingly restive atmosphere deter him. Thus exposition was heard for well over an hour, to the obvious annoyance of many. Questions finally began to emerge at approximately 9:15. At 9:30, the host announced adjournment--"We cannot keep waiting those gracious ladies who have prepared refreshments"--and the meeting broke; it seemed wholly evident that this minister had no intention of allowing full debate. The meeting was frustrating for both Chamberlain and Herbert, and demonstrates in capsule form the serious lack of contact between the campus minister and local clergy frequently encountered at Berkeley.

Although the December 8 faculty resolutions were not directly adapted by the Regents in regular session December 18, an issued statement declared that "policies of the Regents do not contemplate that advocacy or content of speech shall be restricted beyond the purview of the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution."[32] Provision was likewise made for

---

[27] Every minister, except Johnson, related at least one instance in which such encounters took place, though they were often superficial in nature.

[28] E.g., Westminster Foundation distributed a "Report from the Presbyterian Campus Ministry in Berkeley," dated May, 1965, in which discussion of the Foundation's activities for 1964-65 is highly colored by the campus crisis.

[29] See Keith Chamberlain's lengthy letter in *The Christian Century*, February 3, 1965, pp. 147-49, written in response to Robert E. Fitch, "Extremism in the Defense of...," *The Christian Century*, January 6, 1965, pp. 11-15. Herbert also wrote a long statement which, submitted to *Christianity and Crisis*, was not published.

[30] See Shunji Nishi, "Faculty and Campus Ministry," *Humanity*, February, 1965, pp. 7-8.

[31] Nash relates the following incident: "I was just standing there [as arrested students were removed from Sproul Hall and bussed away] with a group of students from here and other places I had just happened to run into and he was there, too [a local minister], and he was saying, 'Now tell me, just tell me, Joan, are, ah, have these students thought about what they're doing?' And I assured him I was quite certain that they'd been thinking for a couple of months about what they were doing. And afterward some of the students who were there came to see me and said, 'Now, Joan, he can't really be for real.' He had made noises about 'I, well, am five blocks away from campus and don't know what's going on.' And the students just couldn't believe that this was so. Well, it couldn't be more so, to be so close to the campus and have so little understanding of what's really going on in this university...."

[32] *California Monthly*, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

"a comprehensive review of University policies with the intent of providing maximum freedom on campus." Neither of these granted the "regulation of time and place only" which the FSM had declared fundamental and one may speculate (as others have done) that further demonstrations might have been forthcoming had not the Christmas holiday recess intervened. The Academic Senate's Academic Freedom Committee, in whose deliberations Chamberlain had, we have seen, been a party, released its recommendations concerning student political activity December 28. On December 31 Chancellor Strong announced "provisional" implementation (to be effective January 4); this was modified January 1 on the grounds that "further study and clarification" were required. Strong received "a leave of absence" the next day and was replaced by Martin Meyerson, dean of the College of Environmental Design. The new chancellor immediately set forth temporary rules governing political activity: rallies, tables and speakers were now legal, subject only to certain "time, place, and manner" qualifications. A new era, so it seems, emerged. In the words of one campus minister, "Things looked very good with Meyerson for a long time."

Strong's most apparent deficiency throughout the fall and early winter had been his inability or unwillingness to meaningfully communicate with those whom he perceived as threats or as challenges to his position.[33] Meyerson recognized this; in his early statement setting forth temporary procedures, plans to solicit the "views of others" were promised as a prelude to any permanent set of regulations and to this end he appointed Dr. Neil Smelser, Professor of Sociology, as a special assistant in matters of student political activity. Herbert and Chamberlain took this seriously.

---

[33] All campus ministers whom I studied expressed opinions much like this rather moderate, comparatively, example: "He was a person utterly incapable of hearing, an insensitive person. He was a good administrator--I really don't know--but the few times I've met with him I just felt as though he simply was not interested in what anyone had to say."

> Walt and I called up Smelser--actually we called the chancellor--from my office just before I went to Mexico, which was the middle of January. At that time the secretary said, 'Yes, we've been meaning to call you.' We didn't know exactly what that meant. But in any case, after I got back Walt and I went in to talk with Smelser for an hour or so.

What transpired there?

> Well, Walt had set that one up. I had just gotten back. And he carried most of the ball. I didn't feel like trying to dominate it. I didn't have much to say, really.... Walt got to talking about his sort of existential picture of what the campus should be, you know, and he discussed everything but death.... Well, shortly thereafter we received an invitation to go up and meet with Meyerson....[34]

Most campus ministers were stunned by this request. Small wonder. "This is the first time the chancellor's office has recognized we exist...." The numbers of people who considered themselves integral to the campus ministry also evoked surprise from both quarters. As one exclaimed, "We had people out for that meeting that had never been to a staff meeting; the Mormon, for example." Smelser also expressed curiosity at the "perfect attendance." Held in early February, with no prearranged agenda, this general session opened rather grimly; the first question posed by a religious worker aired his difficulty in securing dining privileges in the university's cafeterias. From this slow, hesitant, initial probe, discussion ranged over a wide variety of issues and concerns, the most pressing of which, recalled Smelser, "had to do with the relationship between religious organizations and the use of campus facilities. Should religious organizations be understood in a category other than political? Is there any difference between religious speech and political speech?... This is the most pressing problem for me." Porter also understood this to be the key issue.

---

[34] Smelser remembered the content of this meeting with much more clarity than either of its other participants. "Well, they expressed their concern on three matters; none of them had anything to do with religion at all." What Herbert and Chamberlain sought, Smelser recalled, was a genuine effort by the administration which might improve student-faculty-administration communications channels; a serious retrospective study of the crisis and what might be learned from it; intervention by the university on behalf of arrested students. There seems little doubt that Smelser was impressed by these two men and the resulting invitation extended to all religious workers should be understood as a direct result of their action.

> Now when Meyerson invited us, and this particular meeting was really with Smelser...he was seriously asking the question, 'What should the rules be?' And he recognized, I think, the involvement of the religious groups on campus. Not just because we fell under the rules, too, but because we were also commenting on the rules for the political groups and he was interested in getting this information. And Smelser gave every evidence of being a person to understand quickly what it was we were saying. We were grateful for the opportunity.

From this encounter came mutual wishes for another, for which Porter and Herbert prepared a position paper. Entitled "Use of University Facilities by Religious Groups," this statement declared that in terms of these facility's use, no meaningful distinction could or should be drawn between religious and political. Because "it is impossible for the University to define 'worship' for the religious groups," it ought not try. Thus "the university shall control the content of meetings sponsored by the religious groups on the campus only to the extent necessary for the general welfare of the campus." Also, significantly, this statement affirmed the campus ministry's awakened interest in the university as an institution.

> We feel that insofar as a new situation prevails on the campus, it is not to be seen only as an alternation in the University's view of how and what it shall regulate. There has also been significant demonstration of willingness and capability on the part of the campus ministries to involve themselves responsibly and intelligently in University life, with the health and well-being of the University itself emerging as a dominant concern. We enter this conversation about regulations in the same spirit and offer our suggestions in the expectation that this spirit will continue to be demonstrated by us.

Immediately evident are several assumptions. As we have noted throughout this account, direct involvement by the campus ministry with the University remains very much a minority affair. If we suppose that "campus religious workers" number at least thirty, as attendance at these two meetings suggests, only a quarter of these can, by any imaginative stretch, be considered university-oriented. And of this small number, only a fraction finds it possible, we shall demonstrate below, to articulate in any meaningful fashion a content for that orientation. To that extent, Herbert and Porter's "demonstration of willingness and capacity" by "campus ministries" remains more hope than fact. Their insistence that "worship" was not definable by the university is also, of course, not self-evident. Here is Porter's account of the interesting reasoning which produced it.

> We started out on the assumption that there should be no worship services on the campus. But as Walt and I talked about this we came to the conclusion that after all a worship service is no different from a society meeting of biochemists or something of this sort. And we came to the conclusion that there should be worship services on the campus. And Smelser was very quick to pick this up; I was quite amazed at this. And when we said that a meeting of biochemists was a worship meeting, using their vocabulary, worshipping their gods, and presenting their confessions and their dedications, he just jumped in right away and said, 'Amen. That's it, it sure is.' He couldn't see that that was any different from a religious commitment.

Dissent, however, was forthcoming immediately from two positions. Gumbiner presented the commonly encountered Jewish distinction of church-state which draws a careful cleavage between the two, while several theologically conservative groups wished to press openness even further, to evangelize and convert. Porter tried to clarify the difference between this latter position and his own by suggesting that "the mainline Protestant groups find themselves in a position of wanting the greatest degree of freedom for the campus itself, not necessarily for themselves." This was not entirely clear and upon further questioning, he offered the following.

> As we approached the business of the rules and regulations governing the university, all during the discussions of the FSM--well, let's put it this way. At one point we had a meeting of all the religious workers [in October] on the campus, and the question was raised, 'Shall we raise the question of religious rights on the campus?' And we said 'No,' consciously. We said, 'Let's not raise the question of religion and religious groups because, first of all, we wanted the university to deal with the issue of freedom on the campus without clouding it with the separation of church and state issue. Secondly, because we were not in it to get advantages for ourselves in terms of the rights to use univer-

> sity facilities or something, we wanted to deal with the issue of political groups. So this was one of the things that the mainline Protestant groups felt strongly for--to confirm the university itself as a university, as a secular institution, but recognizing that a secular institution has to be free to allow a wide number of things to go on within it, without identifying itself with any religious group.... So the real freedom of the university lies in the possibility of expression of religion in the university, as well as political expression in the campus, not freedom from these things.

Smelser expressed surprise to several campus ministers, and to me, at "the secular relevance" of the group generally; "I found both of these meetings very stimulating and educational." He likewise expressed a keen interest in the church-state debate, and the use of facilities by religious groups, conducted largely by Fisher and Gumbiner.

These sessions with the chancellor's special assistant, called by invitation of the administration, seem significant for at least two reasons. Here is demonstrated a willingness to talk and a desire for ideas and opinions which were previously unknown. The fragile nature of this new-found access to the university's highest echelons was apparent to all, given the temporary appointments held by both Meyerson and Smelser, but most were then guardedly optimistic concerning the possibility for mutual conversation in future months. As Gelwick suggested, "We gained one encouragement, I think...don't try to handle all of our concerns through the Dean of Students' office. Of course, this is something we should have learned long ago." The other evident factor here would seem to be the lack (again) of meaningful structure or organization through which cooperation and coordination could be undertaken as the campus ministry sought to express itself to the University. No consensus had been reached previous to this convened meeting as to what the crucial problems were, much less an ordered method by which possible solutions to them might have been suggested. Here, as elsewhere, events, and the participation of this individual or that in them, seems highly ad hoc.

Nearly all overt expressions of concern during the spring months are corporate in nature, statements drawn by Herbert, Chamberlain, or Porter and informally submitted to the Interfaith Staff Workers for whatever signatures might be forthcoming. As the case of the State of California vs. Mario Savio _et_ _al_. neared trial, Herbert drafted a letter submitted to the presiding judge as an _amicus_ _curiae_ petition, in which he urged dismissal of charges "in the interest of justice." As he forcefully stated:

> We are deeply distressed about a proceeding in which the students alone are put on trial, for their participation in a circumstance where equal culpability is shared by the administration of the university. It seems to us that a straightforward application of the principle of equal justice is impossible when only one of the responsible parties is disciplined.

It is, obviously, a moral argument which emerges here; a dilemma is also obvious, because charges brought against the demonstrators involved trespass and resisting arrest, not the substantive questions of advocacy and "free speech." It was not at all clear, therefore, how the university might be also charged, at least for trespass. Fifteen religious workers signed this letter; Nishi and Gelwick did not, though for differing reasons.

It will be recalled that the December 18 resolution of the Board of Regents had included provisions for "undertaking a comprehensive review of University policies" relating to student political activity; two committees, both responsible to the Regents, conducted separate studies. The Meyer committee, examining problems relating to student groups and procedures for regulating them, issued a preliminary report midway through April which would have, in Draper's language, "laid the basis for wiping out the basis for academic freedom and student rights on the university campuses."[35]

---

[35] Draper, _op_. _cit_., p. 151.

The committee, actively soliciting opinion and comment from interested parties before making its planned final report in May to the Regents, was assaulted from nearly every side, including the campus ministry. Grounding their right to speak on "a basic commitment to the total welfare of this University and a vital interest in its future," the campus ministers signing the statement charged the Meyer Committee with "evad[ing] the dilemma [defined as broken relationships between the "University and the rest of society"] and seek[ing] to hamper those activities on behalf of social justice which seeks rightfully to find their appropriate place in the life of this academic community." After explicating this charge, their indictment concludes with the following plea.

> Accordingly, we urge the Regents to reject the Meyer Committee Report and, recognizing that this University is a community of free and responsible citizens, to adopt a policy that enables the individual campuses to regulate their own affairs in an atmosphere of responsible freedom.

Draper believes, perhaps rightly, that the Meyer Report, mountains of criticism notwithstanding, would probably have been adopted had not the other committee's work been released on May 11. This group, headed by a lawyer and charged with investigating all underlying and contributive causes to the FSM crisis, compiled a searing document in which the Regents and administration, rather than students, received the brunt of criticism. Serious problems exist, said the Byrne study, "in a system of government which induces a substantial fraction of the governed to violate the law and risk their careers in order to dramatize their dissatisfaction." The report thus moved into several drastic and far-reaching proposals which, if adopted, would individually charter each of the University system's campuses. This study also, predictably, aroused considerable controversy, and the campus ministry once again commented.

> As campus clergy and religious workers we have been distressed by the

> events which have shaken the Berkeley campus this year...we feel that the report of the Byrne Group justifies the confidence placed in the group by the Forbes Committee, and we hope that its findings and recommendations will be accorded the most serious and receptive attention. We are not, of course, in a position to speak authoritatively about a report which is based on far greater knowledge of the situation than is at our disposal. But to the best of our judgment, we feel the report is marked by good sense, fairness, and a penetration of the basic issues. For the sake of all elements in the University community we urge that the report be accepted....

Signed by nine individuals, but not Nishi or Johnson, these two statements were sent to the Board of Regents. None believed that either would be determinative, or even particularly significant, for the Regents' deliberations. But those who signed likewise felt such gestures had validity, placing as they did before the academic community the reasoning and position of the campus ministry. As Herbert concluded, "It won't make any difference.... But you do it. You do it because you are concerned."

Two other facets of involvement throughout the spring months warrant consideration here. For nearly all campus religious workers, the twin sessions with Smelser, and the position statements released in response to Regents' committees, constitute the extent of overt expression. Chamberlain, on the other hand, remained rather closely identified with faculty efforts, in turn supporting his relationship with Smelser, summed up in this comment: "We had another meeting with Smelser and in between I've seen him any number of times. He came to my party the other night, you know. I feel pretty easy with him now." Herbert, too, remained active, but in quite a different fashion. As the crisis dissolved into an era of studies, reports, and at least a de façto loosening of administrative controls, organized protest had no villians to flail and "the FSM went on the shelf without a murmur from any quarter, so thoroughly that it could not even be wholly resuscitated in March when the opening of the Second Round demanded it."[36] From that point on, Herbert devoted considerable periods of time to reflection and writing, authoring not only the statements released jointly with other campus ministers, but also two essays in which the deeper meaning evidenced in these events was analyzed. He also prepared and preached from Sproul Hall's steps a sermon entitled "O, Freedom," which drew, by my own personal count, at least two hundred listeners.[37] These writings contain an increasing sense of despair and pessimism, a sense that nothing had really been anchored or significantly restructured. As he stated on several occasions:

> There was a fundamental miscalculation about what had been accomplished and what had not.... There was, to my way of thinking, a serious kind of softness of mind that set in when people thought that something had been done and we were going to move on from there, a failure to recognize that the gains of the fall semester were by no means secure and as this became increasingly evident...attention was distracted away from other sorts of projects.

Several other campus ministers shared, at least privately, these same reservations. An enormous, perhaps unparalleled, crisis had occurred in American higher education and they had been party to it. Yet its meaning, and the response appropriate to it, were still hazy and ill-defined. "We haven't done much of anything, obviously," reflected one campus minister.

---

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 138.

[37] This was an interesting presentation, a moving analysis of the concept of freedom and how it may be achieved in the lives of men. Sproul Hall speeches were a daily occurrence during the spring of 1965, aided substantially by an amplification system provided by the University. Herbert encountered a problem perhaps especially acute within the academic world. His audience listened attentively until, nearly finished, he made the following assertion: "The Bible reckons with such a bondage and bears a strange witness: 'If Christ sets you free, you shall be free indeed.'" This first explicit religious reference drew a noticeable negative response from the crowd assembled and several individuals standing near me walked away.

Gelwick spoke to this same problem when he commented on the "baggage the Christian faith carries in its image. You know, you always wind up at one point trying to demythologize, to separate yourself out from the fundamentalists and some other corruptions to even get started...."

"I think the imperative is there, but I also think that what we do with it is much less clear, because I don't think the campus ministry has ever carried out its speeches about dialogue. This is very difficult, to know what it amounts to...."

Here our narrative ends. Long on both hope and indecision, the spring semester closed itself out, and the campus ministry, as with the academic community generally, sought to apprehend the year's meaning as a portent of the future.

It is now possible to recapitulate several facets of this account important to this study.

1. Our assumption that the crisis could not be ignored is supported. Even those who refused to support specific policy statements or identify with one or more of the contesting groups could not avoid certain minimal demands placed upon them by differing elements in the constituencies served by them or by which they themselves were supported.

2. This involvement occurred very early in the ongoing course of events and is one significant source of support, both moral and physical, for the Free Speech Movement.

3. A minority of campus ministers openly supported the FSM position as essentially valid in terms of issues raised and concessions sought; a slightly smaller group gave sanction to civil disobedience as a legitimate means by which an administration perceived as insensitive, even dishonest, might be compelled to listen, reason, compromise and act; two openly identified with the principals involved in terms of overt action.

4. The points of involvement and the issues believed crucial varied, we have seen, rather importantly; Chamberlain and Herbert, for example, though deeply committed, follow courses of participation and support in

which deliberate cooperation with each other is minimal, courses which converge only tengentially.

5. Neither structure then extant--the Interfaith Staff Workers or the United Church Council--provided a structural basis or context within which debate might constructively and systematically proceed into corporate action.

This is what men did. Why they so thought and acted, however, is less evident. How may this wide variance be at least partially explained? To this we look.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE BERKELEY PROTESTANT MINISTRY: AFTER

A basic assumption of this study has maintained that "individual and group crises...and conflict situations...throw values into relief" (Kluckhohn), and that action occurs within an "action frame of reference" composed of situational factors, perceived obligations, role-defining counter-positions, and value-orientations, all of which impinge upon choice. We have seen the campus ministers in this study as they reflected upon their understanding of Christian ministry within the context of the Berkeley academic community prior to the crisis events of 1964-65. We have also seen their widely varying participation during the crisis itself. This chapter describes and analyzes our principals as they reflect upon that participation, the "why" of their action and the meaning it has for redefinition of their ministries to the university. Their interpretation of the traditional tenets of proclamation, reconciliation and a prophetic vision of community has differed substantially; if value-orientations are in fact crucial elements in the actions of men, these differences should be discernible not only in what campus ministers did, but in what is said about that action as well.

Reactive Actors

Johnson

As was observed in Chapter Four, Johnson's active avoidance of any direct participation in the FSM controversy which could possibly be construed as supportive was highly successful; he was at no point a significant figure in the ongoing events. In one important sense, this position requires no explanation. Almost by definition, it is those elements which challenge routinized procedures, which call into question given values and structures, that must justify doing so. At California, open support of the FSM was initially, and remained, a minority position for student, for faculty, certainly for administrator, and for campus minister.[1] At this point, at least, Johnson stands with majority opinion, placing himself outside an action he believed largely futile and illegal.

This response does not seem sufficiently accounted for by reference to situational factors alone. In all overt respects, Johnson appears relatively free from the structural limitations of a Gelwick or a Porter. Without, for example, any responsibility to either local congregations or a board of directors, he reported almost complete latitude and freedom in the ordering and programming of the Baptist Center's activities. Situational factors might well have *permitted*, even facilitated, deep involvement had the disposition to be involved been present. Conversely, they cannot be finally held to have *prohibited* a more active stance. Only as his value-orientation is related to the crisis itself is Johnson's position more adequately explicated.

> I was supporting the administration, because I didn't agree with the methods being employed. I didn't agree with the sit-ins, for instance. I didn't agree with breaking the law. I didn't agree with holding the police car. I didn't agree with those tactics at all--I couldn't agree

---

[1] "The student movement," writes Joseph Katz and Nevitt Sanford, "appears to be carried forward by the élan of a small minority. Our research indicates that the socially involved students total not more than 15 percent." "Causes of the Student Revolution," *Current*, February, 1966, p. 10. Shortly after The Police Car sit-in on October 2nd, Robert Somers, in an unpublished study conducted through the Department of Sociology, found 30 percent of sampled students favored both FSM goals and tactics. *The Mainsprings of the Rebellion: A Survey of Berkeley Students in November, 1964*, p. 18. Only as the University's customary life of teaching and research was seriously impaired did faculty finally confront the dilemma, many with great reluctance. See, e.g., Lipset and Wolin, *op. cit.*, pp. 252-83, and Alexander Grendon, William Peterson and Hardin Jones (University of California professors), "Crisis at Berkeley," *Science*, June 4, 1965, pp. 1273-76.

> with them no matter how high the motives are. I somehow associate the means with ends, and I can't condone unlawful methods. Dramatic, yes, but not unlawful. And some of the ministry were just wholeheartedly supporting the whole thing and I couldn't do that....

In actuality, Johnson did not support the administration in any significant sense, despite this affirmation to the contrary; support was offered to no one. The FSM had moved swiftly and dramatically outside avenues legally constituted for the redress of grievances and this left them, in effect, outside any legitimating framework he could recognize. Is it not possible, he was asked, for entrenched institutional authority to ignore, perhaps systematically negate, human values and purposes they were initially created to serve, thus suggesting civil disobedience as the only possible form of useful protest?

> That would depend. I guess that's true in some cases, yes. I didn't feel it was true in this case. For instance, if the structure said you couldn't believe in God, you couldn't worship in the way you please, then I suppose breaking the law would be the only other alternative. I didn't feel that was true in this case.

This statement is revealing because Johnson's marginal position with respect to the crisis' participants did not permit access to the factual data necessary for making this estimate. He had quite consciously disassociated himself from the various exploratory and mediative roles undertaken by other campus ministers in this study; neither was he really aware of the great flux and complexity which marked the early months of the controversy. There was simply no avenue open to him by which he could have assertained "wholehearted support" by "some of the ministry"; one must conclude that civil disobedience was rejected upon principle rather than an awareness of possibilities untested by rebelling students and supportive ministers. Given his emphasis upon societal structures as necessary regulators of sinful men, such a reaction is not surprising.

When queried about the "Hammond thesis" of "ambiguity" and "unacknowledgement,"[2] Johnson suggested they might well be problematic for other campus ministers, to the extent that such men depend upon university recognition for a sense of purpose and ministry. Nothing within the denominational structure provides inherent authority, he argued, by which university recognition might be commanded. Indicating that at no time had the university sought him out for any reason, he added: "But if a person sees himself as a minister in the basic concept of the idea of minister then he ought not be really disturbed by this lack of identification because Jesus wasn't accepted by the religious leaders of his day." By an easy extension, this disqualification of Jesus from recognition provides the rationale for unacknowledgement by present structures to his own work. Frustration develops only in those whose inner security derives from external sources and supports.

> On the other hand, if he has a ministry to individual students, or if he has a ministry to faculty members or staff members, and he is actually through his ministry seeing something happen in their lives, then he needs no sanction, no official sanction. He has what he really needs. His authority comes through his ministry. And I think that, probably, if we would get back to the original idea of the minister which in the idea of the New Testament is a person who serves, the slave or the real servant, this is what we really ought to be, rather than some figurehead of some highly organized, structural, religious institution.

Causal relationships become, admittedly, very tenuous here. Does a campus minister feel no uncertainty and ambiguity because, desiring no formal contact with the university, none is forthcoming? Or has theological proposition been invoked to rationalize, after the fact, unacknowledgement? While definitive either/or conclusions seem dubious, it may be well to consider that a self-contained theological position has been advanced by Johnson which demonstrates at no point a religious engagement peculiar to the university as a structure, indeed, to any social structure. The ministry is personal, and apart from mechanical impediments, people may be offered the gospel message wherever they are found. Johnson's relation to the university remains largely accidental in the sense, at least, that except for certain methodological considerations, his is an endeavor possible in nearly any context, and I am inclined to accept his insistence that university awareness of him could provide no significant dimension to his thought.

---

[2] See footnote no. 46, Chapter One, p. 25 above.

His value-orientation, however, is highly compatible with the demands he perceives being made upon him by the Baptist church, demands which he recognizes as legitimate and to which he is accountable. In response to a series of questions asking the type of assistance he would seek when encountering difficulties in programming, finances, or severe problems related to university affairs, Baptist denominational representatives are given as constituting the most logical options for consultation. This is, as is indicated below, a marked contrast to all other ministers in this study, who are much more inclined to consult colleagues on such matters. Although professing considerable freedom in the daily affairs of the Baptist Center, he is here also carefully attuned to denominational expectations. "Yes, we are very free...unless I get out of line or something." What would constitute "getting out of line?"

> I don't know. I've never been out of line, I guess. I suppose if I were teaching things contrary to commonly accepted Baptist doctrine such as openly advocating ecumenical organic ties or actively advocating the virgin birth as myth or something like that, which I have no plans to do.[3]

Apparent in this assertion is the cognitive, legal emphasis observed previously, the emphasis upon right belief and correct proposition. "Accepted Baptist doctrine...the virgin birth..." reflect proclamation as assent to propositions. It is, in the Parsons-Underwood typology of modes of action, a thrust toward pattern-maintenance, to the minister as priest, as an upholder of norms, whose role is conceived in terms of securing and maintaining correct belief and conformity to doctrine. It is, further, set internally within the church as the "action situation," concerned with man's sinfulness and need for personal salvation and commitment to Jesus Christ; as such it calls individuals out of the university context into the protective confines of the local congregation, not as an occasion of creative growth in the context of community, but as protection from and instruction in the constant pressures of a secular world. His deep and clearly sincere desire to evangelize perpetuates an implicit dualism divorcing student from structural environment, and our evidence suggests that Johnson inadequately recognizes the power of social groups in shaping and creating new attitudes and patterns. This emphasis upon cognition and proposition is also present in other aspects of his self-definition of role. We have observed above the distinction he wishes to draw between "intellectual" and "intelligent" as they relate to the Gospel and its presentation; the inability, indeed futility, resulting from attempts to intellectualize the evangelical message. Asked about formal training he believed necessary for campus ministers, two aspects were cited:

---

[3] He likewise admits to an occasional, not always in complete jest, "when-are-you-coming-back-into-the-ministry" attitude from parish Baptists, a subtle pressure which very probably strengthens his awareness of thinking "like a Baptist."

1. The "university situation" should be studied. Taught to inquire, to develop skepticism and doubt, college students form constituencies and groupings much in contrast with passive, captive parish congregations. "Nobody comes around and says, after a meeting, 'My, what a wonderful address.' Usually they say, 'You've got a point there I really disagree with you about.'" Which leads, logically, into a second criterion.

2. A very thorough grounding in apologetics is crucial. "Very basic, philosophical questions" require understanding and "answers," answers derivative from careful Biblical scrutiny. These questions, and necessary responses to them, can be, Johnson believes, "fairly well categorized and classified." For example, "I talk to the kids and the question I hear most frequently is 'What happens to the kids who never hear about Christ in Africa?'" Well, what does? "It's real good to read the book of Romans...."

When the Free Speech Movement raised its charge that intimate, personal relationships, and feelings and affections were systematically denied Berkeley students, it was cast in terms of a prophetic vision of fellowship for which no real correlation existed in Johnson's value-orientation. To be sure, the concept of depersonalization is acknowledged; that is the state of all men who refuse Christ's reconciliation.

> This whole attack on the idea that the individual was being lost and that the university was a big degree machine turning out professional money-makers and that the student had become so isolated from both the administration and the faculty that he was no longer even considered as a person--I think this is legitimate...there's not the personal concern, and this is enough to really infuriate the students. I know it would infuriate me, too.

But loneliness, isolation, depersonalization are overcome only in a "right relationship" with Christ; it is an inward condition. To challenge the structure, particularly in an extra-legal manner, is to place one's expectation improperly. As we have seen Johnson insist, only when structures deny "belief in God" may men stand outside them.

Johnson's lack of campus orientation is also apparent in his reflections upon the role other campus ministers seemed to play in the crisis. Was he a part of any early effort at negotiation?

> No...I really would have hesitated if I had been asked to be. I really wasn't sure what the role of the campus minister was at this particular point. I had a feeling that campus ministers who tried to do that were sort of overstepping their helpfulness.

In what way?

> Well, I really hate to say this but it seems that the religious communities were sort of taking advantage of this to feel needed and to feel an integral part of this university community, because they don't feel a part of the university community, they don't feel really needed, and here was a chance where they could really step in and minister.... It's just that I do not think that campus ministers, for instance, are basically recognized by the university or the FSM; neither one of them would really sincerely listen to the campus ministers...the faculty, it seems to me, were the logical group, and the campus ministers were a sort of extraneous group that really didn't belong there...because I don't feel that campus ministers are that well known or really have that much influence--they have small groups of students..

The assumptions which abound in these statements reveal a very limited insight into the programming then being carried out at certain of the other foundational centers; also not recognized are the many contacts which, again, certain ministers had established with FSM, faculty and administration during those turbulent months.

Johnson readily admits that, whatever his belief regarding methods and objectives sought, certain benefits are now available to the Baptist center which were not enjoyed prior to the FSM.

> Well, in effect I think it's given us a greater opportunity to minister to the campus. The campus is more open, I think. The restrictions for speakers is relaxed, for publicity on the campus is relaxed and I can see that there's a much better opportunity to present a clear Christian message to the campus, on campus.

"A clear Christian message"--a proclamation, as we have seen, of personal acceptance of Christ. This new freedom is evident in the Baptist sponsorship, with the Assemblies of God student organization, Chi Alpha, of David Wilkerson, "a young minister from New York City who has these Teen Challenge Centers to work with teenage students." Preceded by a great amount of publicity and materials supplied by students from both groups (including the distribution of 5,000 free copies of Wilkerson's The Cross and the Switchblade, a paperback describing his evangelistic endeavors within various New York youth gangs), he preached from the Sproul Hall steps a noon-time sermon having, according to another minister present, "a highly evangelistic content." While Johnson is opposed to "organic" ties with anyone, he concluded that "in sympathy and program and basic objective I guess we're about as close to them as any other group I see on campus, with the exception, maybe, of Campus Crusade for Christ."

Johnson's own summary of the year: "The last semester I've kind of been out of it...we've been so busy here with all of our activities...."

Nishi

Early in the crisis, it will be recalled, Nishi had urged caution as the governing factor in whatever response might be offered by the campus ministry. Persuading his colleagues to postpone immediate action, he had sought out Dean Towle, soliciting, without notable success, "additional information" regarding the precipitate banning of student political activity. Events, however, moved with such rapidity that Nishi's reasoned, informational approach was quickly rendered irrelevant. Only at this point in the year's events does he assume an active role, yet even here his response is essentially reactive, designed to thwart the intemperate action he believed was almost certainly about to issue from his colleagues.

As with Johnson, situational factors do not adequately explain this position. Nishi admits of no direct pressures from either local church groups or the governing bodies to which he is responsible. While his deliberate refusal to engage in action of a controversial nature may well account for this harmonious circumstance, no evidence was found indicating restraint based upon pressure, implied or explicit, from sources outside the immediate context. It is Nishi's value-orientation, his interpretation of these remarkable events, that provide insight into his carefully maintained reluctance for overt action.

Unlike Johnson, Nishi's membership in the UCC kept him rather more informed about the crisis itself and the role being played by other campus ministers. But he refused involvement as the UCC and numerous other campus ministers sought to intervene during the October 3 Police Car incident.

> Was this, may I ask, by choice?
>
> Yes...it really was a matter of choice, because my own feeling was that I wasn't sure we ought to be taking sides at this point, which is really what was happening. I didn't feel I knew enough about the situation to take sides and because I felt that both sides were being fairly recalcitrant so that taking sides would be no help.

Two themes should be noted here, for both are integral to Nishi's definition of the situation: the belief that insufficient information was then available upon which an adequately informed judgment and course of action could be formulated, and the insistence that actively seeking a role in the controversy was to inevitably "take sides." Nishi did not believe a truly mediatorial role was possible or, at least, likely. Nor was he willing, we have seen, to sign the various statements issued collectively by other campus ministers throughout the ensuing months.

> I don't know how many [statements] there were. They were coming out almost weekly. I think my blanket reason was, by and large, that these statements were too one-sided. They were not mediatorial so much as advocating....

This statement does not fully coincide with actual developments; apart from the public stand with regard to Proposition 14 issued in October, only the statements authored by Herbert appeared prior to January 1, 1965. Just one of these, entitled "A Clarification" and dated 4 December 64, was cosigned by other campus workers, and it pointedly asserts that "there are two sides. One has tremendous power, the other lacks the funds even to publish its case for the entire public, but it remains a fact that there are two sides" (emphases in the original); this statement closes with the plea seen in Chapter Four encouraging the faculty to assume the "extremely difficult burden" of resolving the chaos and deadlock. Mediation, and how it might be achieved, seem clearly the intent of this position. Nishi's conception of the campus minister's role at this point is consistent with the pattern seen emerging above. Pressure, public statements, and cooperative efforts are rejected in the name of insufficient information. He was not, however, inactive.

> I managed to get together a group of a couple of graduate students who were centrally involved in the FSM and some other graduate students who were almost directly opposed on the spectrum, some members of the administration and some members of the faculty, and we met once a week here, I think for an extended period of two or three months.

The purpose of such a group?

> First, to get some sort of communication established within the group, and second, to see what some of the real issues were, and third, to think beyond the immediate ruckus to the long range destiny of the university.

This group had within it, however, no members of the FSM Steering Committee, and the administration's representation came solely from the Dean's office. "In one meeting we did have an administrative person from the chancellor's office, but it was perfectly obvious from the way he was thinking that there was no point in asking him to come." Immediate influence was not, Nishi insisted, the intent or desire of this group.

> I don't think we conceived of ourselves as any kind of converting group. I'm really not so sure what we thought of ourselves, except a group that could talk about, share our concerns, and if possible think beyond the immediate turmoil and get down to some of the more basic issues....

"Issues" is here interpreted to "communications" and "where the real power in the university lay," the latter residing finally, it was concluded, with the faculty. Neither Nishi nor the group attempted to communicate the substance or conclusions of these discussions beyond the group itself, nor did it meet in response to any particular event or crisis. Given the tremendous debate occurring throughout the entire university community, moreover, this group seems, in its stated concern for "the long range destiny of the university," rather peculiarly insulated from the immediate and pressing issues which seriously divided the campus. The drive toward rationality, toward the ordering of macro-issues bearing only tangentially upon the confusion and perplexing cross-pressures of the immediate context predominates in this particular manifestation of Nishi's reaction to the FSM, and a conclusion that this serves as an effective alternative to direct involvement and confrontation seems consistent with Nishi's value-orientation generally.

This conclusion is strengthened by his response to the Herbert-authored amicus curiae petition submitted to the Berkeley Municipal Court on behalf of the arrested December 3rd demonstrators. Refusing to sign, Nishi argued that civil disobedience "involved a willingness to pay the price, to take the consequences...," and to plead for release without trial upset "the logic of civil disobedience."

> You could argue that if you really believed in civil disobedience then you really had to go through with the court procedures. I suppose my real reason for not signing that one was that it was not based on points of law. It was fundamentally an emotional statement cloaked in ostensible points of law; it was an expression of moral conviction but not really reflecting a legal position.

As above, the validity of contextual circumstances is minimized as order and appeal to law are invoked. In so doing, Nishi overlooks another difficult question basic to civil disobedience; particular laws are flouted in order to provide the basis for legal challenge. Demonstrators were, as we have noted, arrested not for violating campus regulations pertaining to free speech but for simple trespass and it was not self-evident that court proceedings would in fact fulfill the "logic" of such disobedience, for no direct relationship existed between "crime" and "protest." It should be further noted that Herbert submitted his petition to a lawyer who pronounced it legally adequate.

Nishi's response thus harmonizes with his ontological understanding of objective, created order and the Christian faith's defense of the educational world where rational processes enlarge and expand man's grasp of that order. When trouble threatens, he urges more "information"; when events quickly solidify into claim and counter-claim, a study group is formed which addresses itself to "long range objectives." Like Johnson, he is very reluctant to admit necessity at the point of extra-legal action, believing that channels of communication and the use of possible intercessors had not been fully exhausted. "Direct action, if we may use this expression, had been resorted to far too early...there was excessive haste."

> For me, at least, from fairly early on, it seemed as though the apparent issues for which the FSM people were fighting were not the real issues. I still don't know what the real issues are, but when certain conditions for which the FSM apparently were...applicating, when concessions were made...there was a movement exposing other issues...there's a slipperiness about this all; you start pushing here and when conditions are met, you slip off somewhere else, agitating, advocating something else...from quite early on, I was asking myself, now what is really involved here?

Nishi readily admits that "an incredible series of mistakes" was committed by the university's administration, but this provides insufficient justification for overt behavior designed to cripple the community's ongoing life. "I was tempted to conclude that perhaps the real issue, without even being aware of it, perhaps, was a university in which students had as much voice in running the university as anyone else. I guess a South American university, or a 13th century one...." Here, as elsewhere, the issue of free speech, of a university excessively constricting student self-expression and the interrelationships of and between all levels within the campus community is not admitted, as though admission of the claim's justice was to authenticate the mode of response chosen by student protesters.

This measured avoidance of involvement at the level of signed statements characterizes Nishi's general relationship with the UCC. On the face of it, he appears, by virtue of academic degree, age and experience, uniquely qualified to exercise leadership in this organizational arrangement, particularly in light of Hadsel's absence. He declined to do so, and the gulf separating him from other campus ministers at Berkeley was widened substantially throughout the crisis year. We have already noted the deepening emphasis placed by Porter, Gelwick and others upon enumenicity as fundamental to a ministry which seeks to take seriously the multi-leveled nature of the university, leading in turn toward increasing specialization and division of labor as ministries are devised to meet this new thrust. Support, for example, of Herbert's ministry to graduate students is demonstrative of this emphasis. Nishi has consistently resisted such experimentation.

> I wouldn't want to put all of my eggs in that particular basket, because I don't think human activity can be this compartmentalized. I suppose the analogy of this would be the kind of ministry...that one finds in some churches where you have a ministry for preaching, and a minister for music, and a minister for youth...life just isn't this neatly compartmentalized....

Division of responsibility which divorces pastoral concerns from instruction, or separates faculty and graduate students "misses the fact that a particular function or ministry in education can bring to light a whole flock of pastoral situations or make possible a whole gamut of pastoral ministrations" that would, in the comity of such arrangements, have to be referred to the proper party. Nishi thus imagines each religious center, although in frequent conversation and cooperation, to be supporting programming that will be "more or less" similar. He defends this seeming lack of concern for closer, more highly developed organizational patterns by insisting that all Christian activity addressed to the university may be ecumenical.

> Our official title is the Episcopal Ministry to the University, and I think this was very deliberately chosen or articulated. It's not a ministry to Episcopalians; it is a ministry which certainly finds its point of origin in the Episcopal Church, but is addressed to the university... my own feeling would be that whatever we do has ecumenical implications. ... Sure it's done by Episcopalians and it has, in some sense, an Episcopalian label, but it's on behalf of the whole Christian community.

Reaction among his colleagues has been uniform in its despair. The following statement expresses a sentiment common to each of the men studied.

> I just can't remember any discussions of crucial subjects, which were always controversial, that he didn't have to spend some time examining whatever side we were not considering. There is a value to this. But it also, sometimes, gives you the feeling that he's more interested in discussion and theological debate than he is actually in the influence of persons.

Another believed that Nishi "doesn't want to have any structural responsibility"; he was also seen as the "eternal debatist." Each expressed a concomitant sense of uncertainty and frustration which clouds the immediate situation; how shall the UCC form what some of its members believe are more viable channels for action when all such efforts are resisted? Another fellow minister, reflecting upon a recent confrontation between Nishi and the UCC regarding specific points of future strategy, expressed his confusion with the following comment.

> I think it simply makes sense for a group of people who are carrying out a ministry on a campus to work with each other as fully as possible.... The objections that were raised [by Nishi] against it didn't mean anything to me.... I tried to understand them and I think I did, and I didn't see anything in them...they seemed like words and not much else. I don't know...why Nishi takes this position....

In view of Nishi's history, and the value-orientation we have seen emerge in it, such actions are somewhat more explicable. It is important to note that, unlike Johnson, Nishi openly acknowledges the university as a vital entity in the process through which men increasingly perceive an objective, created order; as such, its role as an essential counter-position defining behavior is readily admitted. More significant, however, is his standing _within_ the university. By virtue of the Ph.D. and his teaching position at Church Divinity School of the Pacific, Nishi's role as a member of the academic community has an authentication, a validity possessed by no other minister in this study. He is a bearer of proper credentials, of a recognizable discipline, and his associations with faculty and administrators place him immediately in a relationship of equals. In a real sense, Nishi does not address himself _to_ the university; he is already a _part_ of it. This suggests a fundamental cleavage; Nishi has access to much that is implied in the current religious concern for the university's autonomy and authority, an access that most campus ministers are only now attempting, haltingly, to fashion. What is at stake, therefore, the issues deemed most urgent, may well vary on this basis, and the importance of his differing relationship in the UCC deliberations should be recognized.

Nishi's response to the "Hammond thesis" reflects his position; the problem involves faulty images, rather than none at all.

> I think we are very much recognized to be here in terms of the ways in which people think we ought to be here.... That is, when some parish clergyman from some miles away suddenly realizes that one or two or three of his kids is at the university or that they may be in a jam or something, we may hear from him.... When this hypothetical clergyman off in some other town sees this to be our primary or even exclusive function,...and if the university, on the other hand, has an image of us which is different from this, let's say holding hands with those who are Episcopalian, carrying on some sort of convenient little club activity ...sure, they know we are here, but they don't know why.... I think it's really a question of the appropriateness of the images both the church and university may have...my own discomforture is that these images are usually so very partial.

One finds, of course, very little evidence suggesting an interest in "little club activity," which for Nishi appears to include most of the more traditional, informal social programming designed largely for undergraduates. Commitment to the academic life means most frequently a ministry to graduate students and faculty, where proclamation's emphasis upon the rational calls men to the life of learning and reason, even as they are reconciled to one another within the church as community, where the cultic expressions of liturgy and sacrament both celebrate and renew. Preeminent value is accorded logic and order; the university is to be defended. In the Parsonian model, Nishi is, like Johnson, primarily oriented toward pattern maintenance, stressing dimensions of church which strengthen and encourage the life of the faithful, which draw them into a context of corporate worship and association. Unlike Johnson, however, this pattern extends beyond an internal concern for the church into the external environment of the university. Action in this setting also seeks the maintenance of patterns which protect the university from unwarranted assault, both within and without. In such a framework only minimal recognition of the prophetic insistence upon change is possible, particularly as the FSM moved quickly and decisively into extra-legal channels of direct action, and his refusal to intervene on its behalf remains complete. This position now has considerable logic, for to have done otherwise would have been inconsistent with basic conceptions of the Christian's identification with the academic world.

His constant reference to "additional information," therefore, to the further explicating of all questions involving major decisions of policy and structure, seem both primary and protective. Primary because the very nature of intellectual inquiry is the discovery and ordering of an ontologically conceived objective realm; the Christian, as scholar, participates in this process. Protective, too; Nishi stands aside from many of the consequences precipitated by the action of colleagues. Insistence upon the ecumenical nature of his ministry at Canterbury House seems also to serve this function, foreclosing the necessity of grappling with specifics and a division of labor for which he could be held accountable.

Not surprisingly, the crisis wrought little change in Nishi's conception of ministry. To be sure, the campus ministry is now more visible.

> [It was] the chance to meet people...[to give] some kind of visible witness to people who had no idea of what we were like, a visible witness to them that we were concerned. Perhaps not concerned in the same way some people were...but concerned for the over-all life of the university. We weren't just a band-aid station or fighting the university with them.... In the midst of that situation we were able to say something without necessarily speaking to the immediate issues.

What emerges here serves to substantiate what has been seen above; concern for the university, refusal to support student demonstrators; speaking beyond the crisis itself. The year's events had thrown into bold relief "specific ways in which this gigantic, mammoth, gargantuan kind of educational venture can really show its feet of clay," but frontal attack solves nothing. At the same time, "a great deal was made of the impersonality that's automatically bred by the university. I think that's hog-wash; I don't think the size inevitably breeds impersonality." Nishi's feeling as the crisis year closed itself out:

> More and more I'm impressed by the need to get below the immediate issues to see what the deeper issues are....

* * *

At initial glance, Johnson and Nishi seem strange bedfellows; Baptists and Episcopalians do not often share the same end of anyone's spectrum. Yet typological placement here, based upon superficial empirical observations of fact, demonstrates other relationships not so readily apparent. One must not, of course, minimize fundamental dissimilarities. The content of the proclamation for each man is at crucial points nearly antithetical.

So, also, with their conceptions of evangelism. One minister embraces the university world as a participant in it; the other consciously rejects its influence. The content with which church is defined, and the individual's relationship to it, is also very different. All of these aspects have emerged in preceding chapters.

These are, however, essentially differences of content. In terms of process and structure, aspects of similarity are apparent. Both are forms of pattern maintenance, highly oriented to denominational church organization. Both cast their non-support of the Free Speech Movement in terms of an unjustified recourse to non-legal direct assault upon the university's order and authority. Neither articulates nor implements a dynamic prophetic sense of change by which the denominational student center serves as thrust into the wider social community. Neither admits to conflict in role: for one, the university as a legitimate counter-position is denied; for the other, claim of both church and university are perceived as complementary. Several of these aspects of role and "modes of action" are further sharpened when placed, we shall see, in juxtaposition to Chamberlain and Herbert.

By almost any measure, these are marginal ministries, and this historical position seems likely to dictate their path into the future. Largely untouched by the crisis, they also seem only minimally influenced by the remarkably fluctuating academic scene. If Sanford and Katz are correct when they argue that students will increasingly "seek answers as to how one might achieve such ends as a reliable personal identity, community with other people, and social objectives that will bring comfort and justice to those largely bereft of them in our society,"[4] Nishi's drive toward system and constant analysis will seem highly irrelevant to students imbued with contextual ambiguity and clash of interests. So to with Johnson; his plea that "Ye must be born again," however true, may well fall on ears more closely attuned to "For God so loved the world...."

---

[4] Katz and Sanford, op. cit., p. 10.

Supportive Actors

> There is a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart that you can't take part, you can't even tacitly take part, and you've got to put your bodies upon the gears and upon the wheels, upon the levers, upon all the apparatus, and you've got to make it stop. And you've got to indicate to the people who run it, to the people who own it, that unless you're free, the machine will be prevented from working at all.

Thus did Mario Savio sum up the FSM's description of and attitude toward the University of California. That Nishi and Johnson vigorously reject such an interpretation even as Chamberlain and Herbert testify to its essential correctness suggests but one aspect of the considerable differences observed between these two sets of men. Our concern now centers upon Chamberlain and Herbert, and the various values, doctrines and situational factors which may help account for these disparities.

Herbert

Esther Raushenbush has suggested that "sometimes what stands out is not what a student has studied so much as what he was and what he is becoming. However intense the intellectual concerns may be...one has the impression...that they daily flow into the life of the individual and daily affect its design and direction."[5] If we may paraphrase Raushenbush, what most impresses itself upon the observer is the "becoming" which characterizes Herbert's year of crisis, the manner in which its events "flowed" into his ongoing ministry and the profound changes they wrought there. The subtlety and richness of nearly any man's value-orientation is, of course, difficult to explicate in accurate, objective fashion; Herbert is especially so because the ambiguity, uncertainty and complexity of his own struggle to resolve issues of doubt and conflict renders many judgments doubtful or inadequate. Yet he represents crucial problems which confront efforts to establish experimental, minimally structured ministries within the academic framework; he likewise illustrates the extreme perplexities inhering to ministries which take seriously an existential openness to other humans.

---

[5] Esther Raushenbush, The Student and His Studies, p. 3.

Herbert, it is recalled, utilized his first year at Berkeley for moving throughout the graduate student community, seeking relationships conducive to dialogue about "themselves and the world." From these expenditures of time came his "invisible parish," the seventy five or so individuals related, frequently tenuously, to one another and to him. We have likewise noted the gradual sense of intense rapport which developed between Herbert and members of the FSM's Steering Committee, particularly Mario Savio; the active, partisan nature of his later involvement; and the sense of despair and confusion which pervades his thought and outlook during the FSM's demise in the spring. "You've got to choose," he insisted, as he reflected upon the year's events. But why the FSM?

> Oh, the reason for that is, I think, quite clear; they were the underdogs. The quantity of public opinion against them, the degree of distortion--I mean it's a different situation when you are in the middle of a crisis like this. I mean you don't just come out with an Olympian utterance about how this side is wrong in this way and that side is wrong in that way. The issue is at stake....

Yet he had issued, as late as December 4, the statement stressing validity in both positions. During the complicated private maneuvers which immediately preceded the December 7 Greek Theatre convocation, however, whatever reservations Herbert retained regarding the administration's willingness to acknowledge the fundamental questions were sharply dispelled.

> Mario kept saying, 'Kerr's in a power play. What Kerr's up to now is trying to get some sort of legitimacy back into his office.' And I said, 'Baloney.' [Kerr did not subsequently make the gesture of reconciliation that Herbert had anticipated.] ...he didn't do it, he didn't come to terms on issues, he just continued to pretend that there wasn't anything to fight about, that there was 'lots of free speech.' O.K. There was the point. And it broke, my confidence in Kerr broke. And the thing was, then I felt that I had been a fool and having put so much confidence in him up to that point, I began to look back and say, yes, sure, and to swing very much in the direction that he was just as much of a gangster as the rest of them....

The real impact of this statement is more apparent when placed in the context of his theological conception of "consolidations of meanings." God acts in the lives of men by confronting the partial systems they create, systems affording, in some measure, coherence and meaning to life. The Christian, however, recognizes the inadequacies, the defensive character of human constructs, and to the extent possible, strips them away, standing in openness to both God and men. The task is not easy.

> Because, you see, the moment at which something like this begins to occur, a great deal of fear is engendered. It is very frightening to think that here's something which seems to be indicating that I have to change my life, that I'm not the kind of person I thought I was, that the world isn't the way I've been expecting it to be in some way....

The latter phrase in this statement has considerable importance here, for it suggests the potential disillusion which his contacts with the university's administration, at both the Berkeley and statewide levels, made manifest.

> And I kind of have this notion that the fellow at the top can be counted on, that Kerr then becomes a kind of father-symbol, God-symbol, and that he gets, then, a good deal of the benefit of the doubt, not just because he's in a complicated situation but also because he's the guy at the top....

This reaction seems highly consistent with Herbert's general value-orientation. The evaluative sense, the emphasis upon affections, the deep concern for primary human relationships that strip away pretense and defensiveness is premised upon a sense of trust, of openness in which honesty and directness become vital requisites. Herbert felt such qualities in relating to individuals within the FSM. As his November 19 letter to The Daily Californian stressed, "I must confess to having been impressed by a remarkable gentleness and sweetness of spirit which comes out here...," and phrases such as "individual integrity" and "personal realness" occur with frequency. Kerr, however, was perceived to have violated such trust, refusing to acknowledge their "humanness" by denying their right to open and mutual confrontation of issues they believed vital to the life of the university. Kerr had not been honest and Herbert's own "consolidation of meaning" was severely wrenched. Thus both Chamberlain and Herbert perceive opprobrium in Kerr's conduct. Chamberlain, however, as we shall observe, accounts for this primarily in structural, bureaucratic terms; Kerr represents an aspect of those groupings which hold and administer power, who protect particular interests at the expense of others. As such, one seeks change, individuals with more adequately honed sensitivities; the bureaucracy is humanized. Such a circumstance may be lamented. It is not overly surprising. Herbert's sense of the personal, on the other hand, simply permits no such solution.

The FSM's demise as an actual power within the academic community which occurred, we have noted, in the very early spring, illustrates the enormous emotional investment Herbert had placed in it. Suspending most of the programs developed the previous year, concern for the FSM became the defining element in his ministry.

> Now this was something that I had thought a great deal about, was excited about, something which I had defended against detractors from every side, speaking up for it all the time, something which had been very unjustly attacked again from all sides and labeled with all sorts of things....

Yet, although legitimated by faculty action which produced the December 8 resolutions and certain de facto concessions allowed by the new administration, it dissolved into impotency; Herbert watched it "successively robbed of its power....

> ...not robbed, really, but having people, whose power should rightfully be theirs [FSM], take the power back. The FSM simply got cut to bits in the course of the spring, you know.... It was sad to watch this happen, at least to me.

This "sadness" assumes additional meaning in the light of his earlier expectations. As the crisis unfolded, discussion of "value and meaning" questions which he had so strongly endeavored to stimulate previously now burst across the campus in a "tremendous explosion." Once a lonely prophet, his concerns suddenly belonged to everyone and it was, "while it lasted, very stimulating and exciting." But, as with the FSM, this also had modified and subsided by early spring. Its inevitability he recognized; students must finally study and professors cannot indefinitely delay the multitude of obligations characteristic of university life. This recognition, however, does nothing to replace the "gaps" in his ministry; to invoke a metaphor, the ball had ended and he once again stood largely alone. As he suggested, "I began to have a kind of feeling about my work in the course of the spring. I guess spring was for me very, very depressing. I just got to the place where I couldn't move."

Perhaps not unexpectedly, the vital position occupied by Herbert as he stood between the FSM and the university contributes significantly to his later depressed state.

> In fact, with relation to what goes on in the university, my situation is exceedingly tiny. But for a time in the fall it was ridiculously swollen out of proportion. Here I knew what was happening at the very heart of the controversy; it affected the whole university. I was in a position even to influence decisions that would be portentous for the whole future of the university's life....

This position had, of course, no life of its own.

> And in that kind of situation people who are by and large on the corner of things can sometimes find their way into the middle and it's a very intoxicating and exciting kind of thing. It really is. And so that vanishes. There's a terrific letdown.... This general mood colors very sharply a lot of my feelings....

Indeed it does. Through the early months of 1965, Herbert devoted considerable periods of time to speculation, reflection and writing. From this comes an essay, a sermon and an extended letter which mirror in disturbed detail the anguish with which he seems to have lived. A deep pessimism pervades each, relieved only partially by appeals to the One "who knows us and loves us." In the sermon entitled "O, Freedom," men are described as being in bondage to education.

> And this operation loses all semblance of humane order, so that we say it is a mechanism, not an organism, since it somehow manages to keep running and then it stops running and starts to grind itself up.

Throughout the essay entitled "Beyond the Crisis," numerous thoughts and phrases suggest that "we have come into a time when it appears to us that, ultimately, human life is an absurdity." Underneath men's boredom is perceived "a deep revulsion, a primordial dread which we have no way of fighting." Because men are "lost and alone in a world [they] cannot plumb," they look for an "image of importance into which [they] can absorb" themselves. Only as they are called "out of [their] little reward-systems, out of [their] narrow enclaves" by Jesus are "all the meanings and dubieties and joys and absurdities and the glory and the power brought to a focus intolerably intense" in a "life of inexhaustible riches." These are the same rich, amorphous categories and images present in his earlier The Passion, the protective "consolidations of meaning" men erect which must be shattered. But the tone is markedly more pessimistic, the range of extreme language-forms greater. Neither of these emotional appeals, however, approach the gloomy and peculiar perceptions which pervade his letter to Christianity and Crisis. Ostensibly written as a partisan defense of the FSM, it moves quickly into an analysis of contemporary American society, employing such descriptive phrases as these: the spiritual sickness of modern culture; widespread social pathology; preoccupation with private comfort; dominated by commercialism; permeated with mendacity; beginning to feel a vast imponderable boredom; a nation of large organizations rather than a nation of individual citizens. As a corollary to this catalogue of social ills, Herbert laments the fact that personal responsibility, the expression of genuine individuality, has been lost in the proliferation of large and increasingly insensitive bureaucratic structures, by no means the least of which are the university and the church.

The problems raised by Herbert's literature are crucial. As we have noted, no minister in this study had read any current social scientist or social critic apart from C. Wright Mills and Paul Goodman. How shall such men become informed? In what manner shall personal perception be supplemented? Herbert's extended treatment of the university as a "machine," a metaphor intended to embrace, potentially, all social structures, is pushed to the following, highly irrational statements:

> Life in such a 'machine' dehumanizes the participant because it enervates moral passion.
>
> So that everyone involved becomes increasingly angry and ashamed, and 'the machine' develops a chronic instability which it has no way of understanding.
>
> 'The machine' is incapable of repentance, it is never ashamed of itself, so that it does not gain a clear recognition of its own failings and is therefore incapable of moral growth.

"I'm not quite sure just what I was doing" is the response he offered some months later when questioned about this paper. He did write it, however, at a point in time when the collapse of his entire ministry seemed imminent, and its distortions of social reality bespeak this confused period.

Herbert, too, had the essential features of the "Hammond hypothesis" outlined for him in some detail; the issues of "unacknowledgement" and "ambiguity" he found "plausible," a reaction quite in accord with the year then ending. His orientation was almost exclusively directed toward the university as a field of movement and interest. But the university as a role definer occurred, particularly during his initial year, primarily in a seeming reverse order. That is, Herbert's conception of role derived not from any sense of university expectation or a felt need to conform to academic patterns but rather emphasized those aspects of university life which he believed threaten human integrity, and his understanding of role was in reaction to them. "Everyone," he indicated, "has been perfectly willing to let me go my own way" and he took advantage of it, moving about the campus, committed to working within its environs. His intent? To impose an evaluative, deep-held conception of primary relationships, a concern for the "spiritual and intellectual virginity" of students, upon those willing to listen.

Conversely, he had, as noted, almost no denominational contact during his initial year at Berkeley, the structural religious focus being the on-campus, "invisible parish." Much of his relative unconcern for the denominational church may be seen as deriving from a corresponding lack of interest in doctrinal, cognitive theological propositions, hence creedal forms and denominational practices. Drawing together those "who don't have anything to do with the church in any direct way," he conceived the church as present in the groups they form.

> I would say that this little Bible group constitutes a place where Christian people come together to find a kind of sustenance; I certainly find a kind of sustenance there....

Being unordained, Herbert cannot celebrate the sacraments, but here, too, alternatives have been devised.

> For Good Friday, this group sponsored a party here where we had a meal. ... We had a meal mainly of bread and fish and wine and played some sections from the St. Matthew Passion....

These forms imply, of course, a conception of the church. Drawing a dichotomy between "the church as mother" and the "church as virgin," Herbert defined the former in the following manner.

> ...the church as huge, all-embracing, all-forgiving concern, a reality which can be talked into spending money on things on the grounds that the church should be involved in x labor, the church should be involved in y inner-city work, the church should be involved in campus life, because the church is the great, universal largess....

And the latter.

> ...the committed, intense, community of believers who are critical of what's going on in the world around them, not that much involved in the explicit political structure, perhaps more involved with the emerging political structures....

Herbert believes that campus ministers generally identify with this latter formulation; "very ill at ease in the vast institution," they move outside the dominant political and social structures, identifying with the "not yet," that which now struggles to be born, with embryonic social protest and reorganization. These polar perceptions constitute, Herbert believes, a moral contradiction.

> ...of obtaining the funds and giving the public churchwide justification of what's being done on the grounds of one picture of the church, and then using those funds to build up a ministry which has, you know, a conception of the church which is not only different, but antithetical; this is a moral problem for the campus ministry, it seems to me...this is the first time I've ever verbalized it, but it's been on my mind....

These observations have considerable validity within the scope of this study. Only Nishi and Johnson, we have noted, conduct ministries which appear to involve no points of tension with local congregations. It seems equally significant, however, that Herbert's exposition is framed within the general concept of "campus ministry," and its direct relevance to his own situation is not immediately apparent. Funds supporting his various activities were supplied by a non-denominational agency, the Glide Foundation, for example, and his conception of a "committed, intense, community of believers" was at least partially satisfied through the Bible group, and others, above. Yet, at another point in this study, he suggested that "one of the things I'm definitely thinking of is how this [his own ministry] can be related to the organized church."

This seemingly inconsistent comment may serve to introduce the problem implicit in nearly every aspect of Herbert's ministry examined thus far.

> I had a ball. I still do. But, you know, what kind of construction comes out of this? What can you build? You become versatile, you can talk about a lot of things, but that's not meat and potatoes.

In complex social systems where men are increasingly defined in terms of secondary, associational attributes, where questions asking what a man "is" most frequently mean what does he "do," role, it has been noted, provides a basis for orderly social interaction. By virtue of one's role-position, certain minimal expectations may be assumed, men's positions within a structural division of labor are specified and related to the whole. To have a role is to assume certain irreducible expectations, it is to be defined in relation to other roles within an interdependent framework, to be validated or legitimated as an integral position in the totality of such positions. Johnson, for example, perceived this clearly,-maintaining an identity within a denominational structure which affords for him this sense of authentication. The lack of a widely recognized alternative by which the campus ministry is itself institutionalized and in which campus religious workers share commonly agreed-upon definitions of role appears confirmed by the Hammond study, and its potential dilemmas vividly illustrated by Herbert. Given its experimental nature, his ministry has no structural form, lacking even the identification with a denominational foundation or student center which his colleagues share in common. In Parsons-Underwood parlence, no clear delineation of "the situation of the acting agent" is apparent. Having consciously set aside the denominational church as the internal context of action, no sufficient alternative is discerned within the university; Herbert perceives, consequently, no sustaining structure or institution. The "mode of action" seems evident enough. Of the four categories, integrative, a primary thrust toward "maintaining a relationship to persons" is the compelling theme. Underwood insists that the integrative "style of action stresses feelings and affections more than Parsons theorizes"[6] and our observations of Herbert supports this assertion. But where is the context through which these "feelings and affections" may, with continuity, be expressed?

The state of depression wrought by foreclosure of his expectations sharply focuses upon this question.

> It is a recognition on my part that--well, don't call it recognition because that presumes truth--but a growing persuasion that the kinds of avant garde thinking that I run into about campus ministry and try to build something on have either, because of the thinking or because of me--for the purposes of practical decision it doesn't matter very much--not worked out to my satisfaction. For example, there's the whole business of re-creating every morning when you get up the world that you are going to live in.... There's a few phrases about the structure of the university, and then the word 'dialogue' trickles across, and I think, 'Now we need to get a discussion group going.'

So discussion groups are formed which meet for a time, only to "vanish back into that from which they came." How are such groups brought into meaningful conversation, how is coherence achieved? Obviously gratified with the relationships developed within the interdisciplinary group organized during his first year, Herbert described a futile attempt to expand this gathering. Why was it unsuccessful?

---

[6] Underwood, "Explanatory Notes," p. 2.

> Well, it's hard to know why.... How do you get to know people? Well, you don't just get to know people. It's on the basis of some common interest, common concern, common experience.

Of the seven individuals comprising this grouping, previous contacts with Herbert, either at Harvard or at Union, provided the initial cohesiveness upon which were based further relationships throughout the group itself. Yet this mutuality of respect and friendship was about to be broken because four of the seven planned to leave Berkeley; "another source of grief in the spring...."

> So that means that not only are these jokers busier than the dickens when they're here, it's only by dint of real interpersonal magic that they are able to form a...group. You can't build a ministry on dramatic and exciting anecdotes...you manage to get just a little bit of some kind of commitment...from these people...and off they go.

Perhaps nowhere does the poignancy of this rootlessness and lack of structural definition become more evident than in his perceived "inversion" of the "essential."

> And so in a way your life turns inside out...that is, the things which are for you [meaning the interviewer] distractions, you know, the little conversations on the side, the moment in the coffee shop, those extra fifteen minutes after supper, that kind of thing, the sort of thing you have to discipline yourself about not spending too much time on--the little edge around one's life becomes suddenly the center.

Recalling the "tunnel vision" resulting from a virtually total commitment to academic studies in his own student background, Herbert's confrontation with this inversion left him truly shaken. "When suddenly your idea [of a ministry] is to engage people in conversation, just think what that means." It means, of course, that he was attempting to base a ministry upon considerations largely peripheral in both his own life as a student and the lives of those to whom he sought to speak. "It's...inside out.... And you don't have any kind of authoritative structure to give what you do some kind of regularity." Not a member of the academic community in any commonly recognized form, he was also not a member of the campus ministry to many of those outside his immediate, circumscribed groupings; in the larger university setting, personal charm, indeed, an element of charisma most nearly defines and justifies his presence upon the campus. When the use of "validity" appeared in the course of discussing this problem, it was defined for him as: "That is valid which has a place, which is an ordered part of the structure."

> Well, in that sense of validity, you're absolutely right. No clear social role, you see. How do people relate to me? They say, 'What do you do, are you a graduate student?' I say 'No.' For a long time I used to go through this song and dance about what I do. More and more I tend to say 'I'm a campus minister' and let it go at that. So how are you going to achieve validity?

That is a very real question, both for Herbert and the campus ministry generally. We have noted the dichotomous image of the church which serves to verbalize for him a lack of meaningful denominational relationships, and although he occasionally suggests the need for closer collaboration, almost no evidence indicates the organizational parish will soon become for him a significant role-defining counter-position. His colleagues at Berkeley have also been largely excluded from participation in this emotional and intellectual anguish, and several expressed concern. "At times," lamented one highly sympathetic minister, "I think Walt just doesn't know what he should be doing. I know the [Graduate Student] Commission has just fallen apart and they didn't even meet and there'd be times I'd blow my stack and afterwards I'm sorry...." At one point during late winter, the question of the Commission's efficacy was raised in the UCC, and the debate which followed suggests the ambivalence present in that body. This same campus minister commented further.

> At the UCC Executive Council not too long ago...we'd asked Walt and the

> president of the Student Commission to meet with us; they were supposed to be meeting regularly but they'd never showed and I just said, 'You know, this is irresponsible. We've assigned them this job to do and so they've dissolved it. Well, that's all right but...come anguish with us about it so we can all deal with this problem. It isn't just their burden to bear alone, it's all of ours, it's an impossible situation and we need to consult together about it; where do we go from here?'

Herbert believed for a time that the FSM itself might result in a series of activities which could give form to his abiding concerns for conversation and personal relationships, and at one point he seriously entertained the possibility of establishing a coffee house. These came to naught and indicate yet another source of consternation as the FSM was perceived to have spent itself.

> Let's suppose that the graduate students had gotten into the ASUC [Associated Students of the University of California]. I was working very closely with guys in that group and we could have really done some things around here with graduate students and I would have been involved with some of that policy making. Suppose you have a coffee house as they had in mind; I'd have been glad to help with that. There was something called the Free University...that never came to anything. Well, I was going to be involved in that.... There was something called the Free University Review, a magazine to write about university reform, the university reform movement, these things; this fizzled out.

Thus the FSM and the graduate student community both failed to offer substantive definitions which Herbert might have appropriated. To the extent that models were present in theory their practical implementation was foreclosed by the circumstance of events. It is not surprising, therefore, that Herbert finally resolved this tension and perceived lack of meaningful purpose and structure through appeal to the conventional university model as primary definer of his ministry. He chose during the summer of 1965 to return to graduate school after completing the remaining year of his informal three-year commitment.

> I suppose that actually the reason I want to leave the campus ministry is because I feel my own abilities lie more in academic and scholarly pursuits than administrative and pastoral pursuits. You know that's kind of simple, but....

Well, perhaps not. There is little doubt that his self-assessment--"One distinct feature of my own self is...a kind of restless intellectual critical kind of spirit"--is consistent with the value-orientation we have seen unfold throughout this crisis. Given additionally the extremely vague and ambiguous experimental position he occupied, perhaps no other final disposition was finally possible.

Chamberlain

Porter echoes a widely encountered sentiment when he insists that "Walt and Keith...became most intimately involved by the nature of their freedom of movement away from structured programming...," that lack of organizational responsibilities more readily facilitated the ease with which they were perceived to have identified with the controversy's differing factions. There is much obvious validity in this insistence. Chamberlain's minimal obligations to administrative details at Westminster House and the protective role we have seen Nash play left him relatively free to appropriate and manage time as he deemed necessary. Already noted, however (and of no less importance here), is the wide latitude each minister, possibly excepting Gelwick, enjoys as he shapes his ministry and its implementation; situational considerations may assist or hinder but they cannot account for tendencies or thrusts which any particular campus minister brings to a given situation. In Chamberlain's case, therefore, as with Johnson or Nishi, such considerations may well facilitate; they cannot properly be seen as causative.

Chamberlain even suggested that his position as an interim appointment during the absence of Hadsel placed restrictions upon his freedom of expression. When asked if a one-year tenure negated interest in long-range considerations, he responded with the following comment.

> Only to a certain extent, for I was very concerned about the consequences; it was a more difficult position in a sense, because if it were just a question of risking my job...but I was aware that I wasn't just risking my job, I was risking the kind of rapport with local churches that had been painfully built up by Hadsel over the last five years.... Before Hadsel came here, this was a butcher shop for campus pastors who got squeezed in between the competing local churches and I did not want to jeopardize in any way the kind of rapport and trust that John had managed to build up in the Presbyterian community throughout Berkeley. ... For that reason I did feel hampered, frankly.

In what specific fashion was this freedom impinged upon?

> Had I felt perfectly free to give speeches, I might have gotten up and given theological speeches. But I felt sufficiently intimidated...that I didn't do that.

The degree to which such a felt limitation actually restricted action he might otherwise have undertaken can only be speculated upon. For the immediate purposes here, it should suggest caution in the attribution of structural freedom, even where it appears most obvious.

As we have observed, Chamberlain's meeting with the student Community Affairs Commission on the morning of October 2, called to discuss "some preliminary drafts of the...statement we'd make," coincides with Savio's appeal for support from campus ministers, and their fortuitous encounter involves Chamberlain at an early point. This involvement and rapport, manifested initially through the permitted use of Westminster's facilities, moves quickly into relationships with students, faculty and, somewhat later, members of the administration.

A "Christian presence," the wish to "humanize" social structures--these are crucial themes in his value-orientation. "It was very easy for me to be present at those centers where change was taking place," he indicated, because the sense of "desperateness" pervading the campus drove people to consider any resource, "including even a minister." The ease with which he moved in and between the various levels of this confused environment has already been detailed. What, however, does it mean to be "human" in such a context? What are the values which clarify what men might do? Chamberlain's reflection on these questions poses an interesting point.

> I can't remember when anybody has said to me in the course of this Free Speech Movement, 'On the basis of what values have you acted?' I would say that a sense of justice or a sense of injustice has been very basic. I've watched how students who, whatever their faults and self-deceptions and pride, did have something they wanted to say but were badly treated, were completely ignored by the press.

In addition to "justice," do other theological categories offer illumination? "To be honest, I'd like to be able to say that I acted on the basis of my theology more than I did...," to which he added, "I acted more on the basis of what I consider to be sensible political, social responsibility to these things, which is a sad commentary in a way...." This ambivalence is evident at several points where consequences are drawn from religious values.

> Theology is a marginal part of our existence...and I resist the assumption that you can explain everything theologically. I resisted Hadsel's urgings to quick, hurry up, get out a theological interpretation of this...because we don't have anything to say from a theological point of view.

Simultaneously, however, lack of theological discussion was lamented and seen as an important deficiency in deliberations engaged in within the UCC.

> I've been here all year with these guys and I don't have a clue as to how they think about theology, what they think about man, the church, eschatology; these are important things. Shunji's [Nishi] assistant said, 'Yes, it's about that time of year for that kind of comment...." That's how seriously she felt about theology.

This confusion derives, it would seem, from Chamberlain's implicit reluctance to carry his contextual, existentially-informed concept of "presence" to its logical formulation and conclusion. When verbalizing the basis for a particular action or response he seems deterred by his own recognition that political and social values are more germane than those explicitly theological, a recognition which disturbs him mildly, and one which he seeks to justify with requests for further theological discourse.

What might emerge from such discussion is not clear, as he readily admits: "I don't think it [his support of the FSM] would have been much different, frankly, had I constantly been in theological conversation with peers about this." What seems partially obscured is the fact that a consistent ethical position which stresses the Christian's total involvement with social structures, concerned to create and sustain "true humanity," necessarily emphasizes the social and political. Chamberlain invokes Reinhold Niebuhr as a source of principle, at the same time appealing to Paul Lehmann, finding in the former a "text" to the inhuman possibilities latent in bureaucracy, and in the latter a justification for an immediate, radically contextual, response to particular situations. He suggests, for example, that Niebuhr's concept of sin affords a basis for judgment of the situation because it recognizes "people's capacity for hypocrisy and self-deception on all sides." Occasions demanding this judgment, however, were apparently few. He was asked about the frequency a "critical assessment" was offered.

> Very infrequently. I mean, in personal conversations occasionally.... I think a reminder that you aren't as pure as you think you are, particularly the students. I'd talk to these guys personally and say, 'The worst thing about you is your moralism, not your tactics or your bad manners, your moralism; you make your mistakes with the strength of ten because you think you're purer.' And a few of them would listen but not too many.

It is difficult to assess, therefore, the degree to which the more principled, theologically-based ethic of Niebuhr is in fact informative for Chamberlain's conception of ministry, nor does he really know himself. As he concluded, "I'm more swimming theologically than I was a few years ago." There appears little doubt, however, that his understanding of community with its minimal cognitive elements, its minimal creedal and doctrinal assertions where the Christian is charged with reconciling men one to the other is the vital and controlling factor. Students were being oppressed by an insensitive bureaucracy. Since the Christian must be "where the action is," intervention is not only justified, it is required and, at least implicitly, Lehmann's understanding of ethical action is the dominant "style" appropriated. Given his previous history with SNCC and the Prague Peace Conference, both of which he believes illustrate his "political radicalism," Chamberlain appears to have been admirably qualified to identify with and move in this volatile chain of events.

Chamberlain is a good instance of the "inbetweenness" suggested in Hammond's study. Charged by the church to minister within the university, his official relationship with both is minimal. "I think there's a good deal to that, at least in terms of not being members of the institutions...." Unlike Johnson, who seeks no university recognition, or Nishi, whose teaching position authenticates his presence in the academic community, Chamberlain seeks an integral role while being very much aware of personal objective deficiencies, most notably the Ph.D.

> I would gravitate more towards being a member of the university community, frankly, than trying to become a member of the local church. I want, of course, cordial and fruitful relationships with them, but I would be more interested in being a member of the university community; in fact, probably what I see as the ideal form of campus ministry is to be a teacher, at least part time. You are completely a peer as a member of the academic community.

Immediately evident in this statement is the dichotomy established between university and church; membership in one or, rather than one and. Does this suggest that the definition of one's role derives from the university?

> Yes, I think so, while not allowing the university to be the source of its theology. Its theologizing, of course, comes to some extent out of encounter with the university but the source of its theology has to be the church...and the Fathers, and the Brethren and the Scriptures....

Chamberlain's "of course" is not so self-evident as he supposes. On the face of it, allusions to the "Fathers" and the "Brethren" appear quite incongruous when set beside other dominant themes in his thought. At no other point are such images employed, either in conversation or his writings, and they do not harmonize with his minimal interest in doctrine. Nor did he attempt to elaborate, even when gently encouraged to do so, and it seems reasonable to conclude that, again, questions of principle, questions of traditional theological language have appeared here, also, because he is not fully at home with alternatives.

Reflecting at a later point on the role of teacher for the campus ministry, Chamberlain denied any intention to generalize.

> Let me underline the fact that that was a personal sort of comment.... I think in terms of wanting to be a peer with the faculty because that's where all my friends are, where my conversations take place, and it would be nice if I were teaching a class and had a book that I could discuss. There's a little bit of social climbing mixed in with the whole thing.... Somebody else could be an administrator, perhaps, or a student.

These are still, obviously, roles set within the university and they suggest very little correspondence to the campus ministry as currently constituted. Does this imply abandoning certain of the more traditional student-centered activities the denominational foundations have supported?

> Yes. I think some form of concrete involvement, while not always, would generally be a very helpful thing for the campus ministry. That is, concrete involvement in the institution--invest something in it and derive certain benefits from it and have certain responsibilities.

We have already noted that such "responsibilities" relate to the "humanizing" of institutions, including the university. Chamberlain understands with clarity the intricate web of expectations and demands within which the large state university exists, "caught up," like society generally, "in a period of accelerated social change." To the extent possible, Christians minister from within this context, seeking to find and influence the centers of power.

> A ministry...would consist of knowing to the greatest extent possible the people who are making the changes, and posing questions to them about what you think might be expedient types of decisions in the inter-

> est of short-term efficiency rather than the well-being of the community or the individual.... In other words, making a place for seriously dealing with loneliness, estrangement, hopelessness, as individuals or as groups.

Chamberlain is careful to avoid disparagement of structure and bureaucracy per se. Necessary for effectively organizing modern social complexities, they are to be "positively understood" for what they are and might be; the task is determining what "tendencies" are "dehumanizing," at which point the "critical voice" is raised.

The university as primary role definer has as its corollary, at least for Chamberlain, a conscious rejection of much within the organizational church. As a counter-position, it offers points of identification and role definition which are perceived, but negatively; a role is partially shaped by ignoring or responding contrary to the usual expectation of the counter-position. This is manifest at several levels. For example, "I'm sorry to say that I haven't been in conversation with the local churches," meaning lack of contact with local denominational clergy. He expressed some concern at this disassociation.

> That's where I feel I may have failed in not just seeing the necessity in terms of future building here, to sit down and invite [a particular parish minister] out, to spend a lot of time with him; I'm a little discouraged the way his thinking is running on social issues and general institutionalism....

One notes that social questions and arrangements constitute the basis upon which a personal relationship is seen as desirable, rather than considerations of theological doctrine. His reaction to many of the concepts embodied in the traditional form and life of denominationalism is further emphasized in his discussion of the meaning of ordination. Classically defined in Presbyterian doctrine as a "sacred office" requiring "trials" defined by "the Holy Scriptures," it is the recognition of a man who believes himself "to be called to the office of the Christian ministry," and is characterized by affirming a series of creedal propositions and the "laying on of hands" by those only who have themselves been previously ordained.[7] Chamberlain calls much of this into question. As seen in Chapter Two, he expressed numerous doubts regarding the procedures involved in licensure and, at the request of Westminster House's Campus Ministry Commission, he did not then seek ordination. Many of these same doubts are again in evidence as this issue was discussed.

> I've got lots of questions about it. I have some serious questions about whether it has any validity or not. The idea of only ordained ministers being able to serve communion and baptize and say 'The Lord bless you and keep you' has to be very seriously questioned. Minimal order has to exist in the institution, of course, but the idea that only a certain select group can do these things I find offensive, very offensive.

Perhaps nowhere is his lack of interest, indeed active avoidance of religious dogma, more evident than at this point. Chamberlain was to sail to Europe during the summer of 1965, having been commissioned to do a study of "how the Student Christian Movements in East and West Germany perceive and deal with problems of secularization in their relative political and cultural climates." Ordination before he left?

> Yes. I wasn't sure whether I should be ordained or not. And I asked them for advice and they thought it might be better to be ordained.

Ordination thus appears to him as a highly questionable formality, acceptance of which is finally based largely upon expediency. This conclusion seems verified by his further statement: "And I'm not sure I'll stay ordained."

Chamberlain's perception of the university as the principal source of role definition is undoubtedly a factor in understanding his quick and positive response to the FSM. Highly evaluative conceptions of reconciliation and prophetic concern pose few of the doctrinal, legal considerations we have observed in Johnson and Nishi; committed to a ministry emphasizing the university as a bureaucracy potentially capable of "dehumanizing" students, ensuing events are seen as validating and justifying his action on behalf of the oppressed. We have already observed the considerable skill exhibited as he sensed what each moment and each crisis required and to a rather remarkable degree, he found it possible to cultivate relationships placing him within those enclaves where important decisions were being made. One of his colleagues described this aspect well.

---

[7] The Constitution of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, pp. 137, 140.

> ...but it was Keith who would get up and assess what was going on politically, who was trying to seize power and what was really going on in all this mess.... Keith has been involved with this, you know, the radical left in political groups, for a long time; he knows how they think and operate.

Admirably suited for response in the revolutionary context of the FSM, Chamberlain's fluid and ad hoc ministry suggests numerous dilemmas for periods more nearly "normal," as he readily acknowledges.

> I'd like to start out by reflecting on our sort of feeble attempt to do this, to be close to the center or centers of change going on in the University this past year. It was much easier than a normal situation, of course, infinitely easier.

If that is true, how are such contacts to be cultivated when a crisis atmosphere no longer exists?

> This can be done by a shrewd diplomat, like John Hadsel, maybe, and could only be done by a person who is strictly a peer of the faculty; I mean a guy who is a scholar, probably has a Ph.D., unfortunately, but if he has a good book out he can say 'To hell with the Ph.D....'

Once again the problem is one of validation and authority. Like Herbert, Chamberlain recognized the profound personal burden that unstructured positions impose, and their respective efforts to define and shape an "internal" context of action share certain common similarities. Both decline relationships with local parishes and the church as a sustaining base of support and definition is foreclosed; both look to the university. To be sure, they differ at the point of modality in the Parsonian typology. Chamberlain most closely approximates goal-attainment, the manipulation of the action-field to achieve particular goals or objectives. Other actors and organizations are utilized instrumentally as means through which desired ends may be realized. As such, belief (his appeal to Niebuhr and "justice"), ecclesiastical procedures (ordination), and physical resources (use of his home and Westminster House by the FSM) are employed pragmatically, guided by the objective's requirements.

They also differ in what is perceived as they turn to the university. Having rejected the more traditional forms of the campus ministry in favor of those relating directly to the academic community, certain of the authenticating marks of the university must be appropriated, not in the reluctant Herbertian sense of a locus where, as teacher, crucial questions of values may be critically explored within an ongoing structure. It is, rather, the adoption of internal university roles because real power, and an influence upon the decision-making process, are exercised there. Campus ministers might be, we have seen, "an assistant dean or associate dean or something like that," or "one of us might be a teacher, or one of us a student." In each instance, it is the university which is the validating agency, which certifies the campus minister's presence. Work with administrators and faculty necessitates the Ph.D., unless one has written a (good) book. What is finally implied strongly suggests that the campus ministry has no distinguishable life of its own; its validity, its existence as a recognizable entity, becomes dependent upon the extent to which it adopts "credentials" determined by the university for its own internal structure. The implication for those campus ministries then being conducted at Berkeley? "Well, it means that they're sort of out of it." Apart from assuming roles within various academic levels, what other avenues might be viable for the campus ministry?

> I think if we had a center of some sort adjacent to the university where we seriously dealt with the problems of university reform and invited in those people who are thinking along this area it wouldn't be too hard to get them together.

The vague nature of this proposal should not obscure the richness which imagination easily draws from it. Chamberlain made no attempt to elaborate here although he might easily have done so. The problem is, rather, the deeper one of starting-where-you-are. There was not, at the time this study was being done, any real option which would have made possible the "center" he contemplated. With no apparent relationship to the church, such a center is conceived as the focal point for those concerned with promoting "reform," here defined as facilitating the grouping of like-minded people. The use of information and expertness, the dimensions of university life which emphasize secondary or associational relations, however, seem largely unrecognized. The prophetic concern for reform we have seen emerge from his value-orientation has been cast almost solely in terms of retaining the "university" in the face of an ever-encroaching "multiversity," of promoting conversation across disciplinary boundaries. That many of the university's most significant values derive from its manifold diversity, its many communities and compartments, its complex of interests in and out of which individuals may move largely at will, Chamberlain would certainly agree. But only a minimal recognition of like factors or ways they might be more imaginatively worked with by campus ministers--in part bound by facilities, financial arrangements with denominations' structures, and their own backgrounds and ministerial conceptions--does not appear with any clarity.

This is, of course, not surprising. In a first position, in his first year, caught up in an exhausting, both time and energy-wise, series of events leaving little room for reflection, Chamberlain demonstrates a rather remarkable grasp of problems of power and pressure, and to many of his colleagues, he was certainly the right man at the right moment. But what now?

> I don't know what I'll do. I may go to work for the AFSC or something, or I may end up in a parish. I just don't know. I'm still in such a formative stage, I'm still single, and these things just mean that my future can go many different ways....

* * *

As was true of the reactive actors in this study, the typological placement of Chamberlain and Herbert, based initially upon observation of their action vis-a-vis the FSM controversy, demonstrates numerous other relationships which they share in common. Dissimilarities are also, of course, evident. Based largely upon their understanding and manipulation of pressure, the directions and structures each has employed to achieve desired objectives varies significantly. A question of personality or temperament is also present, although its systematic measurement has not been attempted. The following impressionistic statement by one of their colleagues perhaps summarizes this aspect for us.

> And this is where Walt is at home; he's a teacher and a scholar, in a quiet, reflective way and this is the difference, as I assess it, between Walt and Keith. Keith is the terribly active, political operator in the midst of the action, whereas Walt is the scholar and reflector, the mediator.

There exist fundamental differences, likewise, between the content which each of these men reads into the three religious doctrines we have utilized as defining the Christian's value-orientation. Chamberlain's drive toward "humanizing social institutions," to "being where the action

11

is" (group), does not directly relate to Herbert's conception of "consolidations of meaning" (personal) which are challenged and stripped away by the totally outreaching and defenseless Christ.

But again, as with Johnson and Nishi, examination of the process and form which underlays content has been seen to produce important congruities between these supportive actors. These may be systematized and clarified by first noting certain elements which accrue to both of the outside categories of the typology.

1. As one moves from reactive actors and an emphasis upon proclamation, to supportive actors, the conception of prophetic reordering, of community and fellowship, becomes ascendant.

2. This same direction of movement--reactive to supportive--indicates an increasing degree of evaluative, normative concern and a corresponding diminution of a priori systems and principles, as opposed to the more cognitive, existential, doctrinal components more apparent in reactive value-orientations.

3. Reactive actors retain deep and important commitments to denominational church structures; supportive consciously move away from organizational ties, perceiving the university as the internal "situation of action" from which models for role are appropriated.

4. The crisis provoked only minimal change in the "style" of ministry evident in Johnson and Nishi, at the same time wroughting great change in Chamberlain and Herbert.

In outline, these elements form the following constellations:

Reactive	Supportive
Proclamation	Prophetic community
Cognitive	Evaluative
Internal--church	Internal--university
Tangentially effected	Centrally effected

The dilemmas which these polarities suggest have been clearly evident in the ministries of our four actors. Although the history of each offers evidence that individuals within the academic community have been reached on occasion, none has really bridged, with the possible exception of Nishi, the gulf between church and university in a sustained, ongoing pattern. The case of Nishi would seem more apparent than actual; while standing in both communities, our evidence suggests compartmentalization rather than an integrated concept of ministry which draws upon both for developing rich and diverse patterns of action. The problem of handling knowledge, for example, illumines this question. Both Johnson and Nishi emphasize the independent, objective quality of knowledge. Even Johnson, for whom such emphases derive from a narrow Biblicism, recognizes the validity of given structure and law which are dependent upon an expertise of knowledge. Particularly in Nishi, expertise is recognized in basic terms which speak of clarification, expansion and depth within an objectively given order. In this sense, both men encourage a devotion to academic study and preparation, Johnson at the point, primarily, of vocation; Nishi as an intellectual development of the rational faculties.

Conversely, Chamberlain and Herbert have understood and appreciated the interpersonal qualities which pervade much of the educational process, the sense that knowledge may finally be one, that disciplinary structures frequently impose artificial restrictions upon the free interchange and discussion of mutually vital information and ideas. They have likewise insisted that meaningful lives are complex constructs which develop and deepen as human beings confront one another "authentically," where "true community" sustains and gives form to the context in which individuals move.

Such insights and emphases seem highly justified. In comparative terms, however, all are incomplete and no one campus minister seems to fully recognize, or at least demonstrate, adequate ways of making manifest such insights as a whole. Neither Johnson nor Nishi appear to have grasped the full impact of the student insistence that impersonality and aloneness in the midst of extreme numbers may well require substantial institutional change. Both Chamberlain and Herbert tend to minimize the very real advantages accruing to individuals in the increasingly associational environment of both university and society, the elements of choice and diversity, the freedom of a semi-anonymity. And none of these four campus ministers has conceived and executed structural patterns which permit access to people in the campus context where they in fact are, where individuals are supported and challenged as they appropriate the rigor and demands of a discipline. Such challenge may indeed require interdisciplinary conversation. But this kind of conversation may also avoid, when cast in purely intellectual exchanges of information or methodology, the much more baffling question concerned with the role of expertise and knowledge as students relate these to the wider social world around them and the vocational and professional roles they will one day embrace. A Christian presence which assists and clarifies such relations has not emerged in these ministries. That Herbert attempted an approximation is, of course, evident. But his vision of the possible was severely limited by the absence of some validating structure giving form and continuity.

Our reactive actors move within secure institutional bases but perceive no need for change. Our supportive actors perceive deep need for much change but lack the bases from which it might be fruitfully undertaken. There is no doubting the highly useful roles both Chamberlain and Herbert assumed in what has been called the Berkeley student revolution.

Quick to grasp the fundamental issues involved, their rapid, flexible response moved with events which paralyzed more doctrinaire positions. Within the context of reformation, however, both largely collapse, and thus cast considerable doubt upon the frequently encountered suggestion that such ministries offer models for future action. In each of these four men, the problem remains: How shall the prophetic personalism, the sensitivity and activism of men who most clearly sense the patterns of change in society be routinized into viable institutions? How shall financial resources and physical plant be utilized in ways which enhance the Christian churches' announced purposes in the academic world? If nothing else, what has been observed throughout this chapter may suggest the enormity of the task.

CHAPTER SIX

THE BERKELEY CAMPUS MINISTRY: CONCLUDED

We have discussed thus far four men, each a minister, each a professing Christian, each committed to expressing his beliefs in overt fashion within the university context. William James once suggested that "there is very little difference between one man and another, but what there is is very important," and certain differing, fundamental conceptions of the historical categories of proclamation, reconciliation and prophetic sense of community relate rather specifically to particular modes of response to the same objective set of circumstances or events. This chapter examines the third typological division where, once again, differing emphases upon the basic tenets within an actor's value-orientation correlate with particular modes of action in ways which distinguish them from either supportive or reactive positions.

Middle-range Actors

Porter

Porter, it will be recalled, was involved in the crisis at an early date, representing many of the Interfaith Staff Workers' membership during the October 2 meeting between the administration and spokesman for the newly-organized student protest; he also appeared occasionally throughout our account of the crisis, assisting in the preparation of position statements, conversing with members of the administration, etc. Yet his pattern of participation, while fundamentally sympathetic to student objectives, retains a reserve not present in Chamberlain and Herbert.

Situational factors are of some importance in explaining this fact.

The extensive programming characteristic of Wesley Foundation required substantial amounts of time-consuming, administrative guidance; he was likewise responsible for the daily operation of the building which housed much of this programming. The extent to which these factors are causative, however, is questionable. Supported by his Board of Directors, Porter has been free to shape a ministry in whatever form appeared most viable. Having no direct or formal connection with a local denominational church, there is little indication that potential pressure or expectations arising from such a source must be taken into account, at least with regularity. It is also clear that he willingly accepted responsibility at certain and particular points. One concludes that where he wished to be party to an action, situational considerations did not prohibit him from doing so; invoking the press of time or foundational requirements seemingly justified or rationalized decisions based upon important convictions derivative from his value-orientation.

A basic divergence between Porter and the FSM appeared early in the conflict. "There were," Porter recalled, "a number of situations where I said things in the FSM Executive Committee meetings," but the response was rather uniform in each case.

> I felt perfectly free to attend the meetings and to speak, if I wanted to, in the meetings, although I felt very much that the commitment that the students had made already to particular positions, particular assumptions, ran contrary to my own. And therefore I was really not ready to speak at the point at which they were willing to listen, because I was speaking from different assumptions than they were willing to make.

One of these "assumptions," fundamental to his theological understanding of himself as a "liberal," is the belief that men are reasonable when offered the opportunity to be so. His impressions of the October 2 meeting stressed the "labor-management bargaining situation," the writing of a truce," which "disturbed" him because the image of antagonism he perceived denied the possibility of "reasonable people" who collectively seek solutions to mutual problems. Dismayed at the rigidity of stance he observed in FSM spokesmen, an initial response to their insistence that administrators and most other University officials could not be "trusted" was simply, "I didn't believe it." This feeling persisted for some weeks until continued, close observation of administrative action and policies forced him to rethink and reappraise. Following the Sunday morning meeting of November 22 (which was arranged, one recalls, by Porter), his trust in the administration's good faith had nearly vanished.

> I think my feeling at that point was that Chancellor Strong was completely convinced of his own position, that it was right and that he was simply going to issue these statements in an attempt to head off a student revolt rather than dealing with an issue that needed to be dealt with.

This feeling of rigidity and lack of understanding also extended to President Kerr.

> When...Clark Kerr asked the students to withdraw their gun from the head of the administration so that the administration could make its decision without pressure, this was a ridiculous request. He wasn't asking for no pressure; he was asking for relaxation from the student side of pressure. But there was still pressure from the newspapers, from the legislature, from the Regents and from anybody else who had something to say about the university.

Here, too, "reasonableness" had been forsaken. Porter thus seems best understood throughout the crisis as one essentially concerned with reconciliation, with promoting discussion, with seeking bases for accord. In this definition, "unreasonableness" was perceived very early within student protesters, somewhat later in the administration. "Differing assumptions" and a corresponding unwillingness to reason and compromise thus preclude alignment with either party. At the same time, his emphasis upon community, upon the potentiality of human relationships, upon human creativity and wholeness (inferred from "the historical event of Jesus") which university arbitrariness appeared to threaten suggests 1) the empathy clearly present in his perception of student objectives, as opposed to certain of their more extreme methods, and 2) his active support of measures which offered relief or correction.

These are, of course, objectives also sought by Chamberlain and Herbert. That Porter retains a sense of detachment and critical distance seems due not only to "reasonableness" but also to the conception of role which results from his value-orientation. The "inbetweenness" of his position is readily acknowledged--"this dichotomy is very much a part of our existence"--but the resulting tensions derive, for Porter, from more than simple unacknowledgment or faulty perception on the part of either church or university. They are, rather, to be partially understood as intrinsic to demands made by campus ministers on both church and campus.

> ...two conflicting directions come out. One is the desire to be free enough to move within the university community, to be a part of the university community. But on the other hand is the wish to be sufficiently independent of the university to be able to act as critic and as external evaluator so that there is a freedom to comment on what's going on in the university without necessarily feeling that we are violating our role as a part of the university. Now these, I think, are in conflict.

The advantages of both worlds--that is Porter's objective. The possibility of actualization is unclear.

> I don't know...whether it is possible to be a part of the university and be apart from the university at the same time.

This same question arises with respect to the parish church; still very much a part of it, he would simultaneously adopt a stance of "internal critic." "We are far enough removed," he believes, from the life of the local parish that "the church should welcome this kind of criticism...and evaluation" from one who "loves the church." He feels additional tension when efforts originating in the Methodist Conference are implemented which seek to draw him into a closer relationship with the Church's various boards and committees; this is understood as an infringement upon his own ministry, upon his own sense of freedom of movement. Campus ministers are being "put upon...used" because lack of parish responsibility is interpreted by church officials as lack of denominational identification. As with the university, Porter would here also be in but not really of, concerned for but without binding or inhibiting relationships and connections.[1] The tenuous nature of this position seems rather obvious.

> I certainly have experienced from the campus ministers with whom I'm acquainted a real sense of loneliness, a sense of being isolated, a sense of being 'out there,' kind of cut off in different directions.

His use of "acquainted" here is significant, for there is little evidence that Porter himself feels isolated or "cut off."

> I think the campus ministry itself is developing more and more an integrity of its own, a community of its own, so that instead of having a gathering of parish ministers you have a gathering of campus ministers. We have this at Berkeley, I think; we are fortunate. We have so many campus ministers here at Berkeley that we can have this kind of community. But at the University of Nevada, for example, if you only have one man there, he doesn't have much community around him.

This statement provides a crucial distinction between Porter and Herbert. As we have seen, Porter's eight year history in higher education has been characterized by a gradual but persistent movement from a narrowly-conceived, circumscribed conception of religious education, designed to retain denominational loyalty, to an understanding of student community exercising a semi-autonomous life of its own. His developing sense of critical distance from the church has been accompanied by the two factors we have observed here: a strong undergraduate program and an increasingly meaningful series of interrelationships with several of his Berkeley colleagues. Both of these factors secure for him a validity, a place within a structure, however amorphous;[2] neither is present in the ministry Herbert sought to create.

---

[1] This view results in occasional internal stress which Porter clearly recognizes. After he had offered some critical comment at a recent meeting of the Annual Conference, the Conference bishop responded by suggesting that Wesley Foundation's budget might require future pruning. "In a sense then, there is a threat to the very existence of our special ministry if we participate too much in the life of the local parish...as critics." Porter must, therefore, as a result of financial dependency, remain cognizant of certain minimal expectations originating at the Conference level. Upper echelons of denominational structure are role definers, thus, in ways the local church is not. This freedom from direct reliance upon local sources for financial solvency seems directly related to the levels of independence of action in each of our ministers. At Westminster House one local congregation implied a withdrawal of supporting funds unless Chamberlain's FSM sympathies were expressed less obviously. Nash could resist these threats, in part at least, because the amount involved was a small fraction of the much larger sum received through Synod sources.

When asked to amplify this "community" of campus ministers, Porter stressed two aspects.

> One of them is that it does give me a fellowship with people who are doing the same kind of task and that therefore we have a common language to talk about. But also, I think, there is a tremendous amount of corrective that takes place.

This corrective is the result of an increasing division of labor he sees developing at Berkeley. Given the varying concerns which individual campus ministers bring to the whole, each is made aware of "patterns" that might otherwise go unnoticed. Porter illustrated this point by reference to a former colleague at the YMCA.

> He was always concerned about social action, social movements, and he would come to our meetings and say 'Are you aware that such and such has just happened?' And I'd say, 'Heavens no, I haven't even read the paper this morning....'

He thus defines community, in part, as a forced awareness of a broad spectrum of issues believed necessary to an effective ministry. Notice, however, the implied pragmatism, the absence of well-developed cognitive propositions which define a situation a priori; "fellowship" and cooperation derive from a commonality of "doing." Consistent with his understanding of proclamation as calling men to the "wholeness" characteristic of Jesus, it offers an important differentiation between himself and both Johnson and Nishi. Unlike Johnson's internal ministry of pattern-maintenance, Porter represents an increasingly systematic attempt at integrating church and university into the "internal situation of the acting unit," designed to effect a third option identified fully with neither, but embracing both. In the modified Parsonian model, Porter most nearly approximates goal-attainment. That is, components of action, including facilities, persons, his organization, are manipulated or utilized for purposes of achieving particular goals; normative positions, various beliefs and ideas, are appropriated as they contribute to this same achievement. The goal, we have noted, is an identity for the campus ministry which may address itself in love and service to both church and university, while retaining an objective detachment from which a needed word of prophetic judgment may issue. The means are evident in his reflections upon the immediate future at Berkeley.

---

[2] Numerous manifestations of this were observed. In the Wesley Foundation's newsletter entitled Cross Campus, dated May 11, 1965, Porter is referred to at several points as "Bill," and in an open letter to his student constituency, there appears the following sentence: "I could ask nothing more of each one of you than that you have a community surrounding you which is as responsive and accepting as the Wesley Foundation community has been for me."

11

> I see developing...some ecumenical dimensions here at the University of California where the tension on me is relaxed a bit if I realize that the Presbyterian minister, for example, is ministering to faculty members at points where I don't have any skills. If I know there is a ministry being carried on with faculty people that I would not be able to do, then...what I see as being essential to my work in the Wesley Foundation, in relation to the rest of the ministries being carried on, is to define my area of concern primarily as the undergraduate, organizational structured ministry.

These "ecumenical dimensions" are now possible, he believes, because a greater diversity within the campus ministry is a present actuality. Pastors, teachers, politicians, and chaplains are cited as particular emphases which reflect an expanding definition of attitudes, of action, of that which properly falls within the scope ministries to campuses. In addition, the functions performed by Herbert and Chamberlain, notably their direct participation in the crisis and the resultant flow of information back to the less involved, he wishes to see embodied in yet another ministerial type which he called a "minister-at-large." Did he really believe this a viable concept?

> Well, I think it's not only viable, I think it's essential.... My feeling is that it ought to happen with a particular person who is given this assignment....

What, exactly, would such a person do?

> We're developing a proposal right now; we want to bring an ecumenical staff person to the University of California campus in the direction of discussing political action, Christian faith and students.... [We wish to find] a person who is knowledgeable in political movements and social change, and would be willing to take his place here in the Berkeley campus situation on behalf of the religious groups and move about and attempt to understand the student movements, attempt to understand the student generation, and the methods of social change which the students are attempting to put forth at the present time...we're naive in many of these areas of political involvement, and my concern would be to say, well, 'Look, here is somebody that helps me to be more aware of this dimension, and to be more informed.'

The seriousness attached to this proposal within the UCC is evidenced by its efforts to secure financial sponsorship. Chamberlain was initially considered for this "experimental position" and a letter written by Porter sought funding from the National Council of Churches. When the Council declined, an exploratory letter was sent to the Danforth Foundation; its response was also negative. Necessary funds had not yet been attained when this study was completed, but a great deal of enthusiasm for some plan of this nature was present among most campus ministers of the UCC and additional efforts seem quite likely to occur.

Porter's self-conception in this diversity of function remains, we have noted, the undergraduate program and whatever structure may be required to support it; it has not nor will not "go out of vogue or out of style." Use of the foundation as a basic tool differs, however, from those purposes observed in Johnson and Nishi. Interest does not center in the foundation per se, but as a device for orientation toward and support of the wider social context.

> ...the campus religious center becomes a place from which, if we want to use Elton Trueblood's phrase of the 'launching pad'...a Christian is launched into his activity in the university itself. I think this is of tremendous value and, in fact, I think it becomes more valuable as the place where the whole process continues to receive its definition, its conceptualization, so that it is seen as God's work; that is, that the world, the university, is still affirmed as God's work, and not man's work.

Although primarily oriented toward the university, Wesley Foundation's "launching" operation includes a variety of projects directed to situations within the San Francisco metropolitan area; students have participated in several inner-city ministries, for example. Indeed, from such experiences, according to Porter, three young men had recently announced their intention to enter seminary in the fall of 1965. His explanation of this happy circumstance is illustrative of the desire we have seen to solidify a ministry complementary to, rather than identified with, the local parish.

> I think it was their experience of the church in the inner-city, their experience of the church on campus, their experience of the church being involved in the major issues of the day, where before their concept of being a minister was the image of the parish minister and they had rejected that and never really thought about being a minister in that sense. But when they began to experience the church being involved in the social crises and say 'That's where we want to be and we can be there from a Christian stance,' then they chose to go to seminary to prepare for that kind of involvement.

Porter left little doubt that he understood Wesley Foundation as the enabling agency, providing the structure through which students moved into pressing social settings, and the interpretive framework through which such experiences were given form and meaning. Other activities ranged from tutoring programs to discussion groups in San Francisco dealing with problems of the homosexual. The scope and depth of social outreach should not be over-emphasized; no foundation in this study could be viewed as more than marginally involved at best, with total numbers of students in such projects being very small. No accurate count is really possible, because no two religious centers utilize the same methods for defining social involvement. At the same time, reassessment of this question, spurred dramatically by the FSM controversy, is apparent in Wesley, Westminster and Plymouth Houses, although its systematic relationship to other phases of evolving cooperative programming is not now clear.

When asked to speculate upon the crisis year then concluding and to indicate substantive reorientations it had impressed upon him or the campus ministry generally, he responded without hesitation. "I think it has turned me much more in the direction of the problems of the university." Well, in what way?

> It has opened up a tremendous area which, prior to this, I had not really been concerned about, and that is, what happens to people who are in the university. I think my prior orientation was what happens to individuals where we meet them in the context of the church or in the context of this student group.

Porter's self-appraisal was substantiated by several of his UCC colleagues. Said one, "It was incredible, seeing a kind of awakening of Bill and his university ministry." The absence of Hadsel was offered, in addition to the crisis itself, for this new-found interest and assertiveness. A driving, visionary individual, Hadsel "threatens some of the other men with this, Richard [Gelwick] and Bill in particular, with his aggressive 'let's get on with it.'" During the controversy, however (as we have observed), Porter appears tc have been intimidated by no one. "..,The point is that Bill has really taken leadership. There is a sense in which he has become the elder statesman...."

At another point Porter suggested that for the first time, administrators in the university recognize campus ministers as a group now interested not only in "picking up the pieces of students...falling prey to the system" but, likewise, in "that which affects the students, that changes them or crushes them or elevates them...."

Out of this new-found interest in the university and its impingement upon the lives of its inhabitants, Porter found time to author, quite out of character with his earlier concerns, a lengthy critical analysis of the University of California as an adequate educational institution. Examined below, pp. 249-50, this interesting statement offers additional support to our image of Porter, pragmatically seeking to understand and manipulate those forces and structures which abet or restrict his conceptions of wholeness and community.

Gelwick

Thus far in our analysis of five campus ministers, we have observed a variety of situational factors and definitions of value-orientations. What Parsons has called a "drive toward consistency of self" has been evident; action has occurred which is consonant with such factors and definitions. The breadth and flexibility of that action has been seen to be correlated to and at least partially determined by the interpretive meaning each actor has given religious faith; this action has not been restricted to the crisis only but has ranged over a minister's definition of himself as a Christian ministering to the university community. These statements equally apply to Gelwick.

Like Porter, Gelwick was highly sympathetic to student demands in the initial phases of the controversy. An active supporter of Proposition 14 then pending before the California electorate, he had also urged adoption of the multi-authored statement which accompanied Porter to the October 2 meeting. "I, in the fall, like many other social action-conscious Protestants, saw the Free Speech Movement as very much related to the civil rights movement," and he believed the campus ministry had to be involved in both. The motivation, however, is complex. There appears no reason to question his genuine concern for the university's arbitrary foreclosure of political activity and its refusal to acknowledge the subsequent dilemmas it posed. But the question of "involvement" itself is also crucial.

> I remember feeling very much involved that afternoon in doing all I could.... You don't wait to be right, perfectly right. I thought our participation at that point was more effective for us. It helped clarify, I think, certain things for ourselves. We at least had gotten involved, out of necessity. I don't see that it had much effect on the outcome of the negotiations. But it did get the religious groups involved.

Clearly implicit in this statement is a distinction between the crisis as an objective phenomenon, weighed and evaluated in its own terms, and the much more subjective question of participation itself, the extent to which direct involvement with any social problem is justified. This tension, present in each of the campus ministers studied, is directly related, we have seen, to an actor's value-orientation, and may be resolved at two levels. Herbert and Nishi, for example, appear to have centered primarily upon the _crisis itself_. Their perceptions of events, and the response believed appropriate, vary substantially; they do respond, however, to the phenomena as an object to be understood and acted upon in its own right. Gelwick, contrariwise, gives considerable weight to the _act_ of response, to participation as intrinsically valuable. Because the academic community is one locus of God's creative action in the lives of men, he had argued that participation by Christians in that community was vital. The church _must_ engage the university in conversation as both seek "fulfillment of the human being." This ongoing dialogue had, however, not materialized for Gelwick, partially because the campus ministry had no real access to most levels of the university and partially because the campus ministry itself did not fully understand the necessity involved. Thus, for Gelwick, empathy with the students could be expected--they were encountering the same insensitivity he had known for some time. But equally important, the protest--perhaps any protest might have served his desired objective--provided the impetus through which the campus ministry as a group was compelled to address the university as an institution, and to question policies seen there. The fact that little direct influence was exercised upon current negotiations is not, for Gelwick, the decisive factor. The campus ministry had become engaged, it had acted, and a fundamental point in his value-orientation, his conception of ministry to the university, was in part realized. As he wistfully indicated, "We wanted so much, I think, to be known, and yet we weren't...we were beginning to think of the campus minister as irrelevant.... There is, all of a sudden, some dawning of a connection between the Christian faith and higher education."

If this interpretation is correct, it further assists our understanding of his later reservations toward the conflict's two major factions, particularly the methods being employed. Gelwick shares with Porter, Chamberlain, Herbert, and, to some extent, Nishi, a very strong feeling of complete intransigence on the administration's part. What he had earlier experienced in the granting of Rockefeller scholarships was verified and strengthened by this new expression of inflexibility; the academic bureacuracy, or those in it, seemed incapable to grasping the essential questions of fundamental freedom at issue.

> They really do appear to be afraid of having a free university and distrustful of the idea that in a society where men are given the freedom to debate the truth that the truth will be its own defense. They want to guarantee that one side will win, even when that side may be wrong.

Only massive demonstrations over time, during which administrators and regents were compelled to confront the basic question of speech and political action, were, he believes, adequate to the situation. To that extent, civil disobedience was justified.

At the same time, he began to experience various doubts following the early October round of events. "I see other dimensions that I did not recognize at first." He was asked what those might be.

> I discounted at first the fanaticism; it's fanaticism when you begin to attack the personal character of your opponent and make him appear to be Satan in this kind of black and white analysis.

Gelwick initially attributed such denunciations (most frequently attacks upon Kerr) to politics and the "nature of communicating an important idea." Savio's trip to Selma and his subsequent belittling of civil rights activities there--he derided the Selma march, for example, as a "children's crusade"--served to focus this issue, however, and Gelwick's criticism became more pointed.

> It appears that this generation may be a victim of what some people have tried to argue before--a victim of an absolute moralism, so that while they strongly believe in their ideals, they are not able to regulate them and relate them to a larger context. So these ideals become idols and you crush everything that stands in your way. Now, when you begin to take that point of view, you begin to wonder: 'If these students were capable of it, might they not really try to wreck the university if they didn't get their goals?'

Not all students are classified, of course, in these terms "but I tend to see enough of it." Quite certain that the FSM's effect would undoubtedly rank as "one of the greatest moments in the history of this school," its "tremendous and redeeming" effects may have occurred nevertheless "more by the grace of God than by the intent of these students," and he expressed relief that the "FSM's leadership" exercised no role in the process of "reform."

Again, Gelwick's position is consistent with his fundamental conception of the university and church in dialogue regarding questions of wholeness and values. The protesters were instrumental in challenging the university; this was indeed desirable. But the excessive, often hostile, moralism he perceived in the FSM also inhibited such dialogue. "People never learn...that all things are relative, so the only things that become absolute are their own ideals." Sympathetic? Yes. Supportive? Not to the extent observed in certain of his colleagues.

Yet another piece of evidence supports these conclusions. Gelwick was a signer of all statements addressed to the campus by various members of the Interfaith Staff Workers--the strong endorsement of the Byrne Report, the equally strong denunciation of the Meyer Report, the plea for faculty intervention in the crisis, etc. But his name does not appear on the brief submitted to Berkeley's Municipal Court on behalf of those students arrested during the Sproul Hall sit-in. Dismissal of the charges, he indicated, would have taken "the real bite out of what happened."

> ...In a way, I was afraid this would have the effect of dismissing the importance of what had actually happened. I thought the publicity that would go with the trials in having to really deal with the question--that they had to break the law in order to make their point--was better than dismissing the charges.... I was also hoping that the governor, as well as the chancellor and other administration people, would be subpoened into court and we would get better information about what was actually happening....

His expectations were not served; the prosecution, limiting the questioning almost entirely to the issue of trespass, succeeded in keeping all officials above the Berkeley chancellor from testifying. Important here is the reasoning employed. The basis for opposing the brief, one notes, is not an appeal to principle or to Nishi's "logic" of civil obedience; rather, Gelwick understands the trial to be a forum from which additional discussion of the university might come. Court action could, hopefully, more adequately illumine the impediments to freedom and dialogue he believed present. Again, the FSM is understood in part as a vehicle enabling the realization of his own deeply-felt interests.

Even at that, his reservations did not prevent him from finally concluding in positive fashion:

> The Free Speech Movement for us, I think, has been a God-send.... Relevance is a big topic among campus ministers; they talk about it all the time. Now at least there's a kind of urgency and we've gotten the support of the members of our boards, our students.... There is now a practical example of where [the campus ministry] might have been relevant had it been prepared.

If a deeper sense of concern for and involvement in the university is one significant gain to be realized from the crisis, the other, for Gelwick, is the strong impetus it provided as he sought to substantially modify the Congregationalist's approach to a student ministry. His obligations to First Congregational Church have already been discussed; his situation relative to the Board of Campus Ministry and, by extension, First Congregational, was such, for example, that requests by the FSM for use of Plymouth House's facilities had to be refused. Enmeshed at that time in the "open forum" issue, it was deemed tactically wise to demur if "we were going to fight a battle over these previous two cases." At the same time, having seized upon the crisis to promote discussion and change, a longer-term view emerges which is not similarly present in the other figures of this study. The results are several.

He began by readily admitting the ill-defined role of many within the campus ministry.

> Most of them...are still floundering trying to find out what their purpose is. I mean, we make what the philosophers call certain protocol-type statements about what the campus minister is, but nobody knows what encounter, dialogue, inter-disciplinary study mean. We talk about this but the amount done in the campus ministry seems to be rather small.

Role is not, then, clear-cut?

> I don't think it has been, and...we're still searching for this.

Basic to the problem, he suggested, was the refusal of the campus ministry carefully and at length to analyze itself in relation to the university it presumes to serve. In lieu of this, "we have this kind of impulsive, desperate kind of action, always seeking a new golden key as if this is going to unlock some big solution...." Examination of his own position at Plymouth House led to the establishment in November, 1964, of a Committee for Long Range Planning for Plymouth House answerable to the Board for Campus Ministry. This committee's final report, offered in May, 1965, is important here because Gelwick believes many of his own "preferences" are embodied in it, and because it provides an example of creative interaction between a campus minister and the board charged with supporting that ministry.

The study progressed, he indicated, through three distinct phases:

1. They read, "mostly under my guidance," literature in the field of religion and its relation to higher education, including Cantelon's A Protestant Approach to the Campus Ministry.

2. The committee sought information on the various foundation forms possible, citing Parker Rossman. It also considered data from the Danforth Study of Campus Ministries' pre-test of a quantitative instrument designed to probe religious commitment in students.

3. Statements about "future ministries and patterns" which other campus ministers at Berkeley were then contemplating were solicited.

Gelwick carefully supervised each of these stages, providing interpretation and additional resources, both written and from his own experience, as seemed necessary. The immediate controversy added an efficacious backdrop. As he pointed out several times:

> The FSM was the most conspicuous illustration all the time of the need for a campus ministry. It was always there, and I think made the whole discussion a lot more meaningful. We met weekly at lunch, beginning in December, until a week ago [May], except during vacations. It was a good committee and it worked rather hard, as far as these committees can go.

Several conclusions were forthcoming from this group. "The modern university," it asserted, "is in a period of crisis that affects its traditional nature and purpose." Concluding that "size, the fragmentation created by specialization and bigness, the demands of technology" imposed by business and government present "difficult educational problems," the report declares:

> These problems bear on the Christian doctrine of man, the nature of community, the meaning of personal existence, the goals of society, and the aims of life. Consequently, Christian concern for the university is essential.

This established, certain "basic considerations" pertinent to ministries which must speak to the "university's crisis" were offered. These stress the need for "literate and articulate believers," individuals who "hear and understand" the needs expressed and felt by those within the university; "vocation" must also be more adequately understood "in the light of the Christian faith." Further, Christians must develop "genuine community" in which "the truth...personal and reforming" is heard and learned. Such communities will also "assist in healing the endless divisions between disciplines, between students-faculty-administration, and the lonely."

These themes are highly congruent with Gelwick's value-orientation. Images in which the university is challenged by Christian conceptions of "wholeness," by the unity of creation, by the classical tenets of "liberal education," are fundamental, we have already seen, to his understanding of religion's role in higher education. The concrete goals and "specific recommendations" of this report also reflect his guidance.

1. The campus ministry at Berkeley must become increasingly ecumenical.

2. It must include "a lay ministry" of "theologically articulate laity."

3. It must reach beyond a student-orientation to embrace the entire university. To this end, "earnest experimentation and search" are urged.

4. The campus ministry must provide the locus for mutual service to

> church and university, for "high level dialogue" between these two social entities.

Such goals are to be implemented through a series of structural revisions affecting both Gelwick and Plymouth House.

1. The most immediate (and seemingly non-predictable) declares that, as a "specific and unique contribution" to the ministries at Berkeley, "students and university personnel" should be accorded additional opportunity for relating to local congregations.

> To implement this possibility, we recommend the discontinuance of the present student program of Plymouth House and the formation of a College Fellowship of First Congregational Church for the purpose of integrating the student into the life of the parish. We see the various boards and committees of our Church seeking members among students who wish to serve in this way.[3]

This suggests, superficially, a retrenchment from a ministry of "openness" to the campus, particularly in light of the Danforth pre-test data; although highly interested in religious questions, in issues of values and ethics, especially when related to personal decision, most students were shown to have low interest levels in the areas of doctrine, ecclesiastical dogma and organizational practice. Would they utilize, therefore, this potential identification with a denominational body?

> You raise the danger that everybody sees in this form. Some students have said to me, 'I don't want to be that closely identified with the church.' And in recommending this we are aware that we're going to be different from what seems to be a kind of norm or pattern for campus ministries right now. This is, in a way, a calculated risk....

It is calculated. Gelwick believes, partially on the basis of numerical counts confirming a substantial number of students in attendance at First Congregational's Sunday services who do not participate in Plymouth House's programming, that numerous students may actively respond to the multidimensional pattern of worship, service and outreach distinctive of large, urban churches. These students are often neglected, he insisted, as attention increasingly focuses upon "the more tenuous student who doesn't want to come over here to worship." Too, student social action and protest could be more effectively integrated into the numerous and dynamic social-outreach programs of First Congregational and, thus, "I wouldn't have to attend to that."

---

[3] The use of "our Church," obviously referring to First Congregational, is another unintended indication of control exercised by that church, although in theory, we have noted, Plymouth House is governed by a multi-institutional board.

2. This latter comment implies an interesting clue to Gelwick's attitude and helpfully illumines the second major recommendation of the report, an "Academy of the University Church Council."

> The aim of this Academy is both the cultivation of an articulate laity and the encounter of the best thought of the Church with the best thought of the University.

Such an arrangement serves two useful functions for Gelwick. He is, first, removed from the administrative and social-action activities he finds annoying and time-consuming, accomplished by vesting student programming in the local parish. Second, his own energies, time and professional interest could then be devoted primarily to the Academy's establishment and operation, "working with the university on the basis of whomever would respond."

The rich possibilities he reads into the Academy concept are impressive. Given the many faculty and administrators actively participating in the ongoing life of local congregations, Gelwick expressed some surprise and much consternation at the low-level encounter which occurs between them. Nor has the church devised adequate channels through which concerns common to university groups might be explored with other interested elements within the various congregations. There are, he indicates, a number of highly articulate laymen members of First Congregational, strategically placed within the university's numerous levels, but nothing has been attempted that would utilize or exploit this fact. Likewise, many individuals from the "whole seminary world which surrounds us"--Berkeley is the locus of six Protestant theological seminaries--also hold membership in local parishes but this verity, too, has not been systematically appropriated for church-university dialogue.

> These people are not in conversation with people on the university issues. In this local church, when the vice president of the university meets, say...or...or..., all Pacific School of Religion faculty members, they do not meet on university intellectual issues of our time. They meet more likely at coffee hour....

Does not the "coffee hour" facilitate conversation and discussion?

> Well, here is a good example. Here's Dean Fitch [of PSR] one Sunday meeting Richard Aiken, former chairman of the Board for Campus Ministry, and former chairman of the zoology department. Dean Fitch walks up and says, 'Hi ya, Dick. How are things in the animal kingdom? Are you keeping it under control?' This is about the level, the kind of engagement.

In congregations where the leadership of both university and seminary are found together, as is the case at First Congregational, Gelwick thus believes it crucial that purposive efforts take place designed to bring about personal encounter. Such men are "opinion setters"; as they are influenced by the Christian's concern for higher education, so, too, is the university. We have already seen the conceptions of "wholeness," of the "university," of the necessity for the exploration of values, which comprise the concern Gelwick wishes to communicate. At the same time, he resists any narrow definition which limits his "Academy" to the institutional church. Hopefully appealing to a wide diversity of individuals, the Academy "would be more likely to pull people out of this church...who are concerned about these issues, into a broader context.... The ideas I have... would be trying to deal with points of real need and substance," rather than theological discussion as such.

3. The report concludes by recommending several "experimental missions": a "night ministry" to "local coffee houses, laundries...," wherever "troubled students tend to collect"; a ministry within the university's residential units; a ministry to the "several thousand married students in University Village"; consideration of a resident unit and program for graduate students; a "minister at large" free to respond "to immediate needs and pressures of the campus." This is justified on the basis of the "most effective ministries" given by "two campus ministers...here on an experimental basis and free to respond to the FSM controversy"; and, concluding, a ministry of publications.

The logical manner in which these various assumptions and prescriptive proposals inter-relate is immediately apparent. If one assumes, on the basis of reading, of testimony from those believed knowledgeable, etc., that the university has deviated from traditional "purposes" and that Christianity can speak critically and meaningfully to the ensuing "crisis," the basis of a ministry has been established. It must be ecumenical because the multi-leveled nature of the academic community requires a corresponding differentiation of expertise. A professional ministry of this magnitude, however, is neither possible nor desirable; consequently, laity must be assisted in both understanding and acting upon the faith. In this conception, Gelwick's intense interest in education, his self-image as a scholar and facilitator, are central to the issue. He is, moreover, released from the more prosaic and traditional minister-to-student expectations imposed by Plymouth House and its history.

Actualization of this committee's report will require, Gelwick quickly admits, considerable time and a responsiveness by the key boards within First Congregational which may not, in fact, exist. Whether the Church's senior minister would finally support the plan, and to what degree, was unknown. His position with respect to the local church staff seems relatively delicate and certain of his more guarded responses reflect this fact; nevertheless, a composite emerges which suggests several of the dilemmas inherent in the situational arrangement we have observed here. For example, did he feel restraint or, conversely, support in his initial supportive role toward the FSM?

> No, I wouldn't say that I felt any restraint exercised upon me. I did feel like, at times, I was standing in an area in which any action that I took would be on my own. I didn't feel any sense of encouragement--put it that way.

Had this plan, in which so much of his own thinking emerges, met with approval?

> I think I can guide--I hope I can, at least--the senior minister of this church into working in this area. I think he's interested in it, but I have not given him much help because I'm so tied up maintaining this other program.

Another aspect of the problem manifests itself in a proposal for a "collegium," a living unit or college at Berkeley designed to enhance a Christian "presence" within the university, to provide a residential setting where religious and humanitarian objectives and values might be significant elements of the unit's "atmosphere." It was first introduced by the Reverend Browne Barr of First Congregational and later developed at some length by a committee representing several large Protestant churches in close proximity to the campus. The history and rationale of this proposal are themselves an interesting story; of immediate concern is the nearly complete lack of campus ministry representation within the deliberating group. Not until extensive investigation had been accomplished regarding the existence of such structures in other collegiate settings, and a preliminary proposal drawn, were campus ministers invited to participate.

It was a tactical error of the first magnitude and the Reverend Barr expressed pessimism during an interview regarding the proposal's future. Gelwick expresses a sentiment encountered within the campus ministry generally.

> I felt right at the very beginning that one of the biggest issues the committee did not understand--and I felt contradicted my job, particularly in relation to Mr. Barr and this committee--was that I was really not called upon as a resource person for this group.... My attitude happens to be one of regarding myself as a professional in the field of religion and higher education, and having more than casual information to offer. So I felt this was not a consultation in the sense that the committee or Mr. Barr felt that there were professionals who really had something important to say--the attitude seemed to be 'everyone is a layman at this point....'

At another point in the interviews, Gelwick offered the following observation as he recalled the generally defensive attitude displayed by members of the UCC when finally called to discuss the plan.

> I think we all felt, even though I was in a certain sense present at some of the meetings, castrated and put in an unpleasant position. I think in a certain sense this is one of Barr's original problems, that there isn't in his mind such a thing as a professional campus ministry.

The word "professional" which Gelwick invokes to describe himself has considerable importance in summarizing the concept of role, the style of ministry toward which he is self-consciously proceeding. Stressing a proclamation which calls men to respond to God's self-manifestation and creative activity in the world of human action, it seeks reconciliation through knowledge, through encounter, through structures which build community and enhance humanness. Although he conceptualizes with some specificity a distinctive prophetic vision of Christian thought's contribution to higher education, this is held in tension with cognitive, descriptive analyses of "what is," the dispassionate study of reality implied in the self-image of "professional." He shares with Porter the action mode of goal-attainment, a manipulation and utilization of elements within his control toward spe-

It was a tactical error of the first magnitude and the Reverend Barr expressed pessimism during an interview regarding the proposal's future. Gelwick expresses a sentiment encountered within the campus ministry generally.

> I felt right at the very beginning that one of the biggest issues the committee did not understand--and I felt contradicted my job, particularly in relation to Mr. Barr and this committee--was that I was really not called upon as a resource person for this group.... My attitude happens to be one of regarding myself as a professional in the field of religion and higher education, and having more than casual information to offer. So I felt this was not a consultation in the sense that the committee or Mr. Barr felt that there were professionals who really had something important to say--the attitude seemed to be 'everyone is a layman at this point....'

At another point in the interviews, Gelwick offered the following observation as he recalled the generally defensive attitude displayed by members of the UCC when finally called to discuss the plan.

> I think we all felt, even though I was in a certain sense present at some of the meetings, castrated and put in an unpleasant position. I think in a certain sense this is one of Barr's original problems, that there isn't in his mind such a thing as a professional campus ministry.

The word "professional" which Gelwick invokes to describe himself has considerable importance in summarizing the concept of rôle, the style of ministry toward which he is self-consciously proceeding. Stressing a proclamation which calls men to respond to God's self-manifestation and creative activity in the world of human action, it seeks reconciliation through knowledge, through encounter, through structures which build community and enhance humanness. Although he conceptualizes with some specificity a distinctive prophetic vision of Christian thought's contribution to higher education, this is held in tension with cognitive, descriptive analyses of "what is," the dispassionate study of reality implied in the self-image of "professional." He shares with Porter the action mode of goal-attainment, a manipulation and utilization of elements within his control toward specific objectives, a driving toward a restored "wholeness" by which men are more fully reconciled to one another and to God's manifest action in the world. Also with Porter, Gelwick's definition of the internal "field of action" embraces both church and university; a ministry of reconciliation is possible only as these two social structures meaningfully relate to one another. This position thus deliberately and with some imagination seeks to fashion bridges, channels of communication, between these two social structures. Gelwick's understanding of himself as a professional is elaborated to mean the possession of a body of knowledge, a methodology, and an institutionalized role in which validation and meaning are present. Whether or not the patterns he has sought to construct from the chaos of the crisis can be actualized is a moot question. Of more importance here is the carefully defined objective he verbalizes and the correspondence it bears to the patterns of action he has sought to implement. "I feel," he said, "we're only at the dawn of how to get started at how to have some influence at this university." The FSM's contribution to this "dawning" and Gelwick's attitude regarding the future are well summarized in this statement:

> I'm not sure that everyone could put this into words. But it seems that what is made clear, for instance, at Plymouth House, which is typical of a denominational center, is that this year we're able to talk about an approach to the campus that's much wider, much less church centered, primarily because it's evident that the task is simply so tremendous that if you don't get outside of this building and dare to form relationships with people in the university who have no relationship with us unless we make the effort, nothing is going to happen. I think people understand that now. So a structural approach to work through centers of power and influence can be supported at a sort of basic level, I think....

CHAPTER SEVEN

WHAT IT MAY MEAN

We have now observed our six actors before, during and immediately following the extraordinary events at Berkeley. In this concluding chapter, the typology is examined in greater detail, systematizing the "middle-range" actors in relation to those on either side. Conceived originally as an empirical device discriminating between obviously differing responses to a common phenomenon, it increasingly suggests clusters of variables which offer insight into three relatively distinct patterns of ministries to the campus. Further elaboration of this typology also scores the basic crucial problems which seem clearly to confront, indeed to confound, Christian churches and clergy still grapling with meaningful definitions of "campus ministry." "Professionalism" or "institutionalization" remain a fundamental imperative if the Church would seriously presume to influence or minister to the university community. Yet this study suggests a minimal realization of this mandate thus far at the University of California. Their stated intentions notwithstanding, the Christian ministries we have observed have been, in their essentials, marginal to the university's total life. We have, of course, noted several significant exceptions. But they are that--noteworthy intrusions, mounted from the university's periphery.

Can it be otherwise? The data in this study permits no definitive judgment. Outside the context of certainty, however, several compelling aspects of the drive toward institutionalization seem highly relevant to any satisfactory resolution, and discussion of them constitutes the final task of this dissertation.

* * *

What was true of the two typological categories examined previously is also valid here; deeper commonalities than were initially supposed have appeared. Equally true, of course, are important dissimilarities. Porter's expanding pattern of adaptiveness exhibiting movement from a narrow, church-oriented conception of student "religious education" to a conscious posture embracing both church and university has little in common, developmentally, with Gelwick's intensive training and formal study of higher education. Gelwick defines himself as an educator; Porter continues to invoke, as his particular strength and contribution to an ecumenical division of responsibility, the notion of administrator. There are differences, too, in the content of their theological discourse. Porter's pragmatic liberalism and the use of Jesus as a model for human action is tangentially related to Gelwick's interpretive category of creation and its explication through cooperative, mutually beneficial church-university dialogue.

Again, however, such dissimilarities appear relatively minor in the larger perspective. In terms of structure and their own self-conceptions, these two men are remarkably alike. Utilizing those procedures employed to systematize and clarify our outside typological categories in Chapter Five, the following aspects seems clearly discernible.

1. Reconciliation, rather than proclamation (reactive) or a prophetic understanding of community (supportive), is emphasized. None of these tenets is discrete, of course, as the evidence abundantly demonstrates. But while supportive and reactive actors are concerned with reconciliation, neither offer the same specificity which Gelwick and Porter read into this doctrine as they actively seek its implementation.

2. There is also present in their value-orientations an effort to move between cognitive, existential descriptions of and beliefs about "what

is," and normative, affective concerns for "the ought." They have sought to take seriously the Herbertian plea for "personal authenticity" and an existential openness to persons (affective), while affirming certain aspects of Nishi's appreciation of theological bases and historical antecedents (cognitive).

3. Unlike reactive actors, whose "style" of ministry was altered only minimally by the Free Speech controversy, or supportive actors whose ministries were substantially modified by these same events, both Porter and Gelwick emerge with complex, carefully defined conceptions of campus ministerial roles which give much attention to building upon the current situation and to responses based upon perceived needs amid a fluid context. It is significant that Nishi's published article in reaction to the crisis is, as we have observed, essentially a defense of the modern university; Herbert's written sermons are reflections upon human irrationality and evil, and upon the enervating, dehumanizing nature of many social institutions; Chamberlain writes pragmatic analyses or defenses of the FSM. Porter's most impressive written contribution, on the other hand, is an exposition of educational philosophy, an attempt to speak directly to pressing issues within the university; Gelwick supervised a committee which produced an imaginative statement concerned with future experimentation. Risking the obvious, we may observe that, on the basis of their respective value-orientations, each of these written efforts is not only consistent and explicable but, given the fact of written materials, also predictable; they seem, thus, to further corroborate the general interpretation given above.

4. To the extent that "middle-range" connotes an appropriation of some intermediate position, a balanced equilibrium between extremes, its descriptive value in this context is at least partially impaired. Gelwick

and Porter have apprehended various realities and elements, as noted, from both polarities, seeking to fashion self-definition and organization which avoid or counter deficiencies, debilitating factors perceived in the ministries of reactive actors--inability to appreciate and respond positively to constant change--and supportive actors--the lack of meaningful sustaining structure. The "internal" field of action has, at least verbally, circumscribed and related church and university. In so doing, however, both men have eschewed dependence upon either as sole definer of role by employing authenticating "professional" images which are dependent upon neither. Imaginative alternatives of action are visualized; that is, multiple levels within the university are seen to require a diversity of ministerial skills realized only through organizational divisions of labor. In the light of these considerations, then, "middle-range" may be given more precision through employing an appelation as "trans-active," a movement across, the appreciation and incorporation of much from both polarities. This term more adequately implies, perhaps, the variegation here intended.

The dimension of individual-group is also less sharply delineated in Gelwick and Porter. Not dichotomous in any of this study's actors, it is even less so now; both men, we have noted, place much emphasis upon individuals within the university complex as entities with deepfelt needs, with problems of self-definition and discovery. Equally important, however, has been an insistence that such needs, the drive toward "wholeness," are satisfied only as men relate to one another in social arrangements, as they more adequately grasp the nature and meaning of the social world in which they live. J. Edward Dirks insists that the man of "faith" is "free neither to think exclusively in terms of personal responsibility and to ignore the problem of corporate work and the functionings of institutions, nor to resolve Christianity into a program for the improvement of collective life while neglecting the profound inner renewal which it demands from men."[1] Of our actors, Gelwick and Porter most consciously attempt the necessary synthesis.

The various elements here discussed now form, in outline, the following three constellations:

Reactive	Trans-active	Supportive
Proclamation	Reconciliation	Prophetic community
Cognitive	Cognitive-evaluative	Evaluative-affective
Internal--church	Internal--embraces both church and university	Internal--university
Tangentially affected ministry	Utilized crisis to effect and consolidate	Centrally affected

H. Richard Niebuhr once wrote that "when one returns from the hypothetical scheme to the rich complexity of individual events, it is evident at once that no person or group ever conforms completely to a type."[2] Niebuhr's caution is pointedly relevant; none of the three categories conveys the intricacies of these six actors. Yet each man has spoken sincerely, openly, often at considerable length, and they have acted, responded to events which impinge directly and with consequence upon their sense of ministry and purpose. And unless they have been seriously misunderstood, the typology here evolved throws into reasonably sharp relief certain fundamental questions affecting the very existence of this specialized Christian effort. Can one meaningfully, for example, speak of a Protestant campus ministry when this term potentially embraces the disparate thought and action we have observed above? Widely varying role conceptions and their concomitant tensions and strain have been evident in our sample, resulting from divergent value-orientations, personality factors, and structural or situational limitations--the possible combinations are considerable. Yet such variation challenges any possibility of significant content in this definitional phrase, "campus minister." Notwithstanding, Gelwick and Porter have spoken of themselves and their ministries as an evolving profession.

---

[1] J. Edward Dirks, "Diversity in the University," Student World, First Quarter, 1962, pp. 54-55.

[2] H. Richard Niebuhr, Christ and Culture, pp. 43-44.

The beclouded nature of the problem seems vividly illustrated by reference to Acting Chancellor Meyerson's invitation in the spring of 1965. As noted, over thirty individuals understood themselves to be, in some sense, campus ministers, although many were quite unknown to one another. "In some sense" is the pivotal phrase. If "campus ministry" is to shelter beneath its definitional expansiveness the multiplicity of purpose and structure represented by those in attendance at this conclave with university administrators, status as a recognizable professional body, possessed of knowledge and standards by which it is self-defined and is so understood by others, is a hope only, yet to be achieved. There appears to be not so much a campus ministry but rather ministers at campuses. And, unsurprisingly, the problem of "What are we?" falls upon them in very uneven fashion.

To speak, for example, as Gelwick does, of a "crisis of self-definition" to the Southern Baptist ministry would have no real meaning; Johnson, by defining his internal field of action with reference to traditional parish models, functions in sum as the priest, as the church's agent. This role evolves from and participates in a classical, clearly-delineated conception which Johnson finds highly meaningful and sustaining. Demanding nothing of the university, he imagines nothing it might reasonably expect of him. Return to the parish by him could be explained only as a transition of degree, rather than kind, for he has not, actually, moved outside ✓

its defining influence.

Nishi likewise partakes of this priestly function, but, unlike Johnson, he exhibits easy mobility between the spheres of church and university, fully accredited in both. Priest, teacher--authentic conventionalities which legitimate what he is and what he does in both institutional worlds. That these need not, in any compelling or essential manner, interrelate, seems true a priori, and this assumption seems amply confirmed in the subsequent inquiry. Both church and university exist in Nishi's action situation, but the resulting compartmentalization thus renders as relatively unimportant the issue of professional identity, and was so perceived by him; if one is already a professional, the lack thereof (in someone else) can hardly be of vital concern.

Our supportive actors, contrariwise, isolated from the institutional church, yet marginal to the university, have encountered enormous relational problems. Characterized in significant measure by uncertainty, tension and lack of precise referents, Herbert is an anomaly within the academic context, acknowledged only by dint of intellectual capacity and personal magnetism. Wishing to stimulate and challenge through direct confrontation, his ad hoc and fortuitous relations with students was contravened by the university's routinized procedures and expectations; these ordered patterns were finally perceived by Herbert to afford no genuine possibility that his conceptions of trenchant dialogue and intense personal encounter could become integral to the university's ongoing life. So, too, with Chamberlain. The immensely confused and perplexing flux of major crisis permitted him to move with relative ease throughout several sectors of the university and he functions, we have seen, with admirable skill. But the manipulation of power and influence of decision derivative from a value-orientation which stresses "a Christian presence...where the action is" require access to policy-making centers; these were increasingly foreclosed as revolution gave way to reformation, as the more usual patterns of institutional life were re-established. Only by adopting positions within the university's "power structure" could Chamberlain conceive a ministerial form adequate to the task--"humanizing" the bureaucracy.

Although the specifics differ, both of these men leave, accordingly (or prepare to), the campus ministry as presently defined, acknowledging the university as the principal determiner of future expressions that Christian concern will assume in the educational context. To the extent they are representative, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that many such individuals--personally innovative and impatient with present patterns, or occupants of ill-defined, structureless experimental programs--will solve their ambiguous futures by choosing alternatives outside the presently constituted campus ministry.

To speak, therefore, of a crisis within the campus ministry is to circumscribe acutely the discussion's participants. If our typology is credible, both polar categories fall outside this immediate question; one sees or feels no such crisis, the other apprehends it so pointedly that tenure in this position is highly uncertain and unlikely. The dilemma seems ultimately to embrace the Gelwicks and Porters who are committed to a sense of professionalism not solely dependent upon either church or university as referents; it is the "trans-active" actor who must create the necessary structures through which lives lived in tension and strain are kept coherent.

How a legitimating institutionalization derivative from their sense of professionalization is to emerge, however, is by no means self-evident. We have seen both Gelwick and Porter articulate such a position with some specificity, but the mechanisms for implementation of a newly-emerging professional role have been conspicuously few. Parson's analysis of the institutional process suggests the reasons which underlie this paucity and its perusal here provides a basis for consideration of future action.

Discussing the development of American medicine, he cites numerous conditions which, in their cohesion, have institutionalized the medical role in our current social structure; several speak to the immediate problem.[3] There must be, he argues:

1. An arbitrator and sustainer of role norms. In medicine, training, scientific innovation and the necessary "general cultural tradition" have converged in the university as "the principal trustee of that tradition, as the focus of its institutionalization."[4]
2. A "direct role structure." Again for medical practice, an intricate, carefully defined web of social relationships has emerged which govern the interaction between doctor and patient, channelizing and making explicit the expectations and obligations of each.

Both of these require as a prerequisite an "adequate state of knowledge," a body of ideas and factual data which is then ordered and applied through these two mechanisms. Ideas and facts must become embodied, writes Parsons, in social roles; only thus does "empirical knowledge acquire the basis for a major influence on action."[5] Implied in such organizational arrangements are a number of salient elements. An institutionalized profession is, virtually by definition, its own standard; professional codes of conduct or ethics are recognized as arbitrators of acceptable, overt role behavior. Medical practitioners not only establish standards of medical competence, but vociferously defend their right to do so. The situation is highly analogous, it would seem, with the academic guild system; those who violate professional custom or otherwise fail to satisfy predetermined criteria for excellence may be divested of their professional status: medical boards revoke licenses, professors are not granted tenure, priests are defrocked, etc. Freedom of self-definition and regulation has also meant freedom from financial control, another prerogative zealously defended by the medical profession and often echoed in the academic world's insistence that monetary support must not include political manipulation.

---

[3] Talcott Parsons, The Social System, pp. 347-48.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 348.

[5] *Ibid.*

Insofar as these aspects of institutionalization are requisites, the future of campus ministers seeking to create in sustained fashion a semi-autonomous "profession" of which Porter and Gelwick speak is uncertain. No social institution is identifiable as a "trustee of tradition" at least in part because the campus ministry has no such tradition in the Parsonian sense.[6] Nor does there exist the "defined web of social relationships" through which the campus ministry relates to and serves a distinctive clientele who actively seek out an offered and necessary service. Further, campus religious workers have come to no internal resolution or determination of "codes" or "standards" that receive anything like universal acknowledgement as determinants of action. Of the thirty (or so) individuals at California who count themselves within the religious ministry to some segment of the academic community, a reasonably informed estimate could place not more than seven or eight inside the categories, the frame of reference, which Gelwick articulates. And if the insistence of this study be granted, that fundamental conceptions of role derive from equally fundamental aspects of an actor's religious value-orientation, achievement of a commonly-held consensus seems remote.

---

[6] The university, medicine's guardian citadel, serves no similar function here. Shedd declared in 1955 that "in no other university or theological school excepting Yale is there a department with a carefully defined curriculum, leading not only to the divinity degrees, but also to the Ph.D." and while a small number of other theological faculties now encompass this dimension (e.g., Pacific School of Religion), recent conversation with Professor Dirks indicates possible retrenchment at Yale. Shedd, reprint from The Christian Scholar, pp. 3-4.

Compounding the dilemma by its uneasy presence in the thinking and planning of virtually all campus ministers is their nearly total financial dependence upon denominational largess; the very nature of such ministries negates the possibility of monetary self-sufficiency. Parsons cites another seemingly analogous case in his discussion of the "specialized role of scientific investigation," stating that "the technical nature of specialized science means there develops what may be called a communication gap. The scientist is inevitably dependent on 'laymen' for support and for the provision of facilities."[7] Because the layman, however, cannot competently assess the scientist's role or achievements, a barrier of language and understanding is erected, mitigated in this instance by the custodial role played by the university and by the "high valuation" placed upon scientific endeavor in "Western society." The campus ministry shares this problem, verbalizing a relatively esoteric ministry not understood by, or contrary to the beliefs and expectations of, large numbers of local pastors upon whom it is finally dependent. Parish clergy, through numerical strength, usually predominate on regional or state finance-controlling boards. As they perceive campus ministers to be advocating action and belief not consonant with the purposes or objectives of the denominational church, continued support of the more innovative phases of the campus ministry may indeed become precarious. At this juncture, Parsons' "communication gap" bulks very large.

---

[7] Parsons, Social System, p. 338.

Options which promise resolution to the institutionalization dilemma seem limited. Maintenance of the status quo as a viable possibility, exemplified in the ministries of Nishi and Johnson, has been rejected by Gelwick and Porter as insufficiently responsive to "God's action in the academic community." A second option declaring the professional minister within the university context to be superfluous or, as with critics like Cox and Malcolm Boyd, demonstrably detrimental to the aspirations of "true Christianity," are obviously unacceptable also. Because this position has received increasing support of late, however, it warrants brief consideration here. Cox offers the following summary observation.

> The importation of the organizational church with its divisiveness, narcissism, and conservatism into the university community has not succeeded in producing a viable style of Christian life within the university. Worse, it has tended to drain off the Christians who were there into trivial machinations in a separate ecclesiastical make-believe world....[8]

Hence:

> What is the role of the church in the university? The 'organizational church' has no role. It should stay out.[9]

And Boyd:

> Hopefully, the 'religious' foundations on campus will soon disappear, along with chaplains-with-portfolio. These separatist ministries could be replaced by the serious work of lay persons, Christians who are an indigenous part of the university scene. Possibly then, a sober, committed work of Christian mission and evangelism might be undertaken. It is badly needed.[10]

Several responses to these men are possible in the light of this study. One may say, for example, that even if they are descriptively accurate, recommending that the church abandon its structural presence on university campuses is irrelevant. No evidence at any point--including the large denominational churches whose pastors were critical of several phases of campus efforts--supports the possibility of withdrawal. This observation is probably valid throughout the wider context of higher education generally; Kolb and McCoy state that while "in recent years predictions have been made that the professional ministry will soon be eliminated," these "forecasts are at least premature and appear to be without substantial foundation."[11]

---

[8] Cox, op. cit., pp. 235-36.

[9] Ibid., p. 236.

[10] Malcolm Boyd, "Cautious Christianity on Campus," Renewal, October-November, 1965, p. 11. Presumably, however, this new arrangement would retain chaplains-without-portfolio, chaplains-at-large like Boyd, whose ministry consists of one-night stands with college students across the entire country. His task: "blasting" religion "because it stands between the people and God." Such "blasting" activities require, apparently, no structural expression save the seven Episcopalian organizations which support him.

Of equal importance, however, is the factual question. Cox and Boyd lose sight of Paul Weiss's stricture that "'the University' is indeed a personified abstraction. In a realistic view there is no University--singular; all we have is universities--plural."[12] The generalizations which appear in the above statements do not accurately describe the particular campus ministries examined in this study, although the vague and emotional language employed--divisiveness; narcissism; trivial machinations; sober, committed work, etc.--makes careful comparison and analysis quite impossible.

Also disturbing to campus ministers is the lack of alternatives offered by this position, even if the "withdrawal" conclusions be admitted. What visible patterns would an ongoing religious expression assume? What provision for worship, for cultic expression, would or could be arranged for disparate groups of Christians scattered throughout the university? How would the campus Christian meet Gustafson's assertion that "a pure fellowship of persons, or of spirit, cannot long exist without the development of definite political structures as well as doctrinal and liturgical patterns?"[13] Cox does not try, but rather believes that alternatives need not be specified.

---

[11] William L. Kolb and Charles S. McCoy, The Campus Ministry in the Context of Higher Education, Part III, p. 32. Unpublished paper prepared for the Danforth Study of Campus Ministers, 1964.

[12] Paul Weiss, "Science in the University," Daedalus, Fall, 1964, p. 1194.

> But what are the alternative shapes of church life within the university? Perhaps prescription of these shapes before the fact is unwise and unnecessary. When Christians have enough courage to 'come out' of the present crippling structures, God Himself will provide the new ones.[14]

To which Herbert responded:

> What are those things which Christ is doing in the world that are visible only to the eyes of faith? Well, o.k., I have eyes of faith. But what does that tell us? Nothing. Absolutely nothing.

The characterization utilized by Cox may be, of course, a faithful rendering of campus situations elsewhere, but its minimal correspondence with Berkeley offers nothing substantive to Gelwick or Porter.

A third option is the contrary of the second; one seeks, in Weiss' well-turned phrase, to "make a coherent future out of a piecemeal past," to create, within those limits ultimately set by denominational control of finances, such defining standards and procedures as are possible. The question revolves about the frequently encountered phrase in Gelwick (and reflects the "internal" dimension of the typology)--"dialogue between church and university." Campus ministers, acting cooperatively, are seen as relational agents, moving between church and campus, professionals who understand the meaning and substance of both social structures and who provide the bridging link through which one "speaks" to the other. This duality is crucial to the role sought by Gelwick and Porter; they are the church as it ministers to the university community. They are equally a significant channel through which the church appropriates the knowledge and expertise of the academic world. Failure to approximate either of these directional relationships must by definition counter the drive toward institutionalization. Visible and seemingly consequential results perceived as beneficial to the financially supporting church must be apparent or pressure develops for withdrawal of support on grounds that accomplishments do not justify the necessary expenditures. Such "beneficial results" assures the church that its interests in originally constituting a university ministry are being served. Campus ministers must also communicate the relevant aspects of higher education to the churches involved; exclusive concern on the part of campus ministers for the campus only widens the "communication gap," increasing suspicion and a sense of cross-purpose in those who retain financial control. These points are demonstrable by data in this study, and are referred to again below.

---

[13] Gustafson, op. cit., p. 41.

[14] Cox, op. cit., p. 236.

The remaining pages of this thesis are thus addressed to observations of a speculative nature, calling attention to several aspects of "church-university dialogue" which relate rather directly to the desire for institutionalization the Gelwicks and Porters so very much desire. Our concern shall be to examine both of these institutional directions.

The Ministry to the Campus

What seemed evident at California in the summer of 1965 was a new-found sense of cautious enthusiasm and expectation. Expedited by the crisis, it was premised upon theological value-orientations which emphasize concern for social institutions and those within them. This in turn led to consideration of new plans for cooperation, a diversification of function and structure not previously thought really possible; Gelwick's Academy exemplifies this new thrust. Still startled, and not altogether unsuspicious of the administration's recognition of them, these campus ministers perceived a freedom of movement about the campus that lent an aura of credulance to their rising expectations. In the flush of this budding relevance, Gelwick, Porter and Nash were asked by the UCC to design and draft a working paper which would explore new avenues of ministry within the university itself, and the necessary organizational structure and staff required to implement them. It is significant that, on the basis of this study's data, the form taken by these UCC explorations was predictable. Even as Gelwick and Porter devised new shapes of future programming, Nishi became the principal source of resistance and caution as this plan was presented for discussion during May of 1965.

This working paper is ambitious, seeking to bring practically all phases of the university as a social structure within the UCC's purview.[15] Several staff patterns are projected, the most notable being "ecumenical employees," campus ministers whose major responsibility would be to some functional or specialized area within the UCC framework, retaining denominational obligations as an ancillory commitment. Also anticipated is the requirement for "an ecumenical Board of Directors," a legal, corporate body empowered to solicit and receive funds. These will come, it is suggested, from multiple sources: local and national foundations, denominational church groups, etc. This Board could and would then hire specialized staff

---

[15] Joan Nash, William Porter and Richard Gelwick, "Report to the UCC," unpublished working paper, dated May 19, 1965, prepared for the UCC, Berkeley, California. A "beginning list" of pertinent "areas" includes: "collegium, publications, international [ministry], retreats and classes, educational reform, residence halls, University Village, denominational [foundations], social action, ecumenical coordinator, public relations, interpretation," p. 1.

personnel for the outlined program areas. None of this seems particularly surprising in light of the proposals' authorship, as many of these particulars had already been explored by Gelwick and Porter during the FSM controversy. There seems little question that theoretical arguments for such a ministry emphasizing specialization and a careful delineation of responsibility are persuasive. Organized in a methodological and consistent manner, such diversification within a common structure might well correct certain prevailing redundancies, various duplications of effort, thus permitting the most effective concentration of the finite resources, both financial and human, which are currently available. Such patterns also suggest that visible results might be perceived by supporting bodies as more commensurate with expenditures. As stated by one local clergyman, present denominational centers "doom campus ministers to working with a small number [of students]." Reaching a larger segment of the student population was seen by him as essential if denominational support was to be available in future years.

Practically, however, the procedural issues in such a schema are enormous, not the least being a complete lack of certainty that the necessary funds or denominational authorization will be forthcoming, both of which are vital to any truly organic program. No definitive answer has yet been given, at least in part because the problem has importance far beyond the Berkeley campus and must finally be resolved at the higher denominational levels where multiple phases of church outreach compete for such resources as are available.[16]

---

[16] The Presbyterian Church, supporting its campus foundation programs largely with surplus profits derived from sales of its Faith and Life church school curriculum, has been forced to phase out all staff people in excess of one at each campus center. Berkeley, with Hadsel and Nash, is reportedly the lone remaining exception nation-wide. As Nash indicated, in

There are more fundamental questions than these, however. What does "a ministry to the campus" actually mean? The implications in this innocuous phrase are evident in the following statement from a Presbyterian pamphlet: "It is of utmost importance that the church take seriously the contemporary situation within higher education if its ministry is to be effective."[17] "Take seriously" has been variously defined. Cantelon writes:

> The Christian community is coming to a new understanding of itself as the people of God called together in obedience to the gospel within the university.... To do this effectively the Christian community must be actively involved in the total life of the university, know where this life is most seriously threatened, and be willing to identify its efforts with concerned secularists in order to preserve the life of the university because God loves it and has purposes for it.[18]

In the same volume with Cantelon, Harry Smith believes that:

> [Since] the university is not simply an accident of history but a unique order in God's creation, we do have a right to pose certain questions about the faithfulness of the university to its calling and the integrity of its response to a God who is Lord of Truth.[19]

The common theme discernible in these statements portrays the Christian as an influence within the academic community. Singly or in concert with other believers, the university's life, its integrity, is to be defended because it is God's or a locus of God's action. In more prosaic language, what seems clearly intended is influence upon academic policy; encompassed within the above sentences are allusions to manipulation stemming from normative phrases as "total life of the university," "seriously

---

the context of the proposed ecumenical structure, "One time we're talking about bringing in additional staff people and on the other side positions are being phased out for lack of funds."

[17] The Campus Ministry: The Context, History, and Practice of United Presbyterian Campus Christian Life, no author cited, p. 12.

[18] John Cantelon, "Introduction," in A Basis for Study: A Theological Prospectus for the Campus Ministry, pp. 10-11.

[19] Harry Smith, "The Christian Faith in Higher Education," in A Basis for Study, p. 112.

threatened," "preserve the life of the university," and "unique order." These same images, we have seen, are explicated in some detail by both Gelwick and Porter as they invoke the classical "uni-versity" and an historical tradition of liberal, moral education as bases for value-judgments relative to the Berkeley campus. The concept of a minister-at-large, free to circulate throughout the different levels of the university, seeking relationships at the points of power, the seats of decision--in short, a lobbyist--graphically illustrates one practical means of bringing such images into practical fruition.

At the same time, if we assume that such rhetoric signifies more than mere internal communication by which campus ministers rationalize their relative impotence, severe problems of perception--what--and communication --how--seem apparent. Many current religious writers have offered the campus ministry undeniably rich and useful theological analyses of the university, setting it within the context of Christian faith and providing ample justification for renewed concern for its "life" as an institution. Most frequently wanting, however, has been the same imaginative translation of "faith statements" into language which makes possible fruitful discussion and understanding with those whose own analyses, ways of thinking, proceed from differing basic presuppositions. Theological description is thus imagined to be sufficient and judgment takes place from it. The problem is a lack of discerning what H. D. Aiken calls the "levels of discourse"; argument moves directly from basic and self-authenticating first principles to evaluation of concrete situations, ignoring and circumventing intermediate levels of evaluation.[20] Such situations result in agreement on a particular action only after accord has been established regarding the first or ultimate principles involved. Smith may be entirely accurate when he insists that the university is "not simply an accident of history but a unique order in God's creation"; this phraseology, however, seems poorly calculated for securing discussion with concrete individuals in university administrations or teaching staffs. Nor is the bridge even attempted; the reader is informed that "the implications...for the church's mission on the campus are too numerous to detail here."[21]

---

[20] See Henry David Aiken, Reason and Conduct: New Bearings in Moral Philosophy, pp. 65-84.

Not only the problem of "how" but its corollary, "what," is equally pertinent. Bayly believes he is speaking descriptively when he exposes the "helplessness of the professor or the student in the apparently meaningless academic grove" as being "but a reflection of a similar helplessness throughout society."[22] It may be that modicums of value reside in such phrases but their choice in a work addressed to the university and claiming to be both factual and remedial seems unfortunate. And what is an administrator to do with Arthur Lelyveld's insistence that he link forces with campus ministers in order to stem the "multiplication of mass men?"[23] Advocacy of a "ministry to the campus" seems inescapably bound to a correlative expertise intimately cognizant of university complexities and capable of meaningfully relating the claims and aspirations of faith to them. Given the general lack of specific training beyond the Bachelor of Divinity degree, a scarcity of such expertise is understandable and accounts for what Chamberlain called the "sophistication gap" existing between many campus ministers and the academic personages they seek to influence. It is, for that, no less undesirable.

---

[21] Smith, op. cit., p. 114.

[22] Denis Bayly, Academic Allusion, p. 174.

[23] Arthur J. Lelyveld, "Interreligious Relations," in Walter, op. cit., p. 249. He further argues that "varient religious groups working together" may succeed in slowing down "the almost irresistible march of society toward monolithic, deadening uniformity." P. 255.

This problem has not escaped the campus ministers in this study. We have already noted, for example, the peculiarly poetic, euphuistic figures of speech with which Herbert described the social world around him. Porter offers another example in his extensive, carefully-argued critique of Clark Kerr and the "multi-versity" referred to above. Placing salient aspects of the "multi-versity" in juxtaposition with their counterparts in Nathan Pusey's image on the university, the case for "education for persuasion" (as opposed to "education for profession") is advanced in a forthright manner, leaving little question that Porter both understands and prefers the tradition which Pusey represents. But defense of Pusey inevitably contains implications for policy when argued within the California context; one such change Porter believes paramount is a near-bifurcation of teaching and research.

> I would propose that there is a need for a re-appraisal of the demand that each professor be involved in both functions. This is not to say that they should be isolated into one or the other category, but that the opportunity be given to concentrate in one or the other, with only the absolute minimum of overlap for those whose talents and interests lie primarily in only one aspect of university life.

That is the sum total of his proposed change at Berkeley. The problem lies not with the conclusion drawn; numerous educators have advocated similar divisions of responsibility for some time. Rather, it lies with what is not said. Nothing in his proposition conveys to an audience an awareness that the history and sociology of this university quandry has been understood and appreciated, that he recognizes the considerable thought and experimental attempts that have preceded him. Nor does it acknowledge the guild system in which men hired ostensibly to perform one task--teaching--

receive promotion, salary increments, status and standing among colleagues, indeed, judgments regarding their personal worth as scholars, from another --research and its publication. How could such changes be reasonably expected from or even considered by those with power of decision, when the hoped-for proposal has no linkage with the university world beyond the Berkeley campus? These issues are not at all unfamiliar to Porter, of course, and in conversation he elaborated on each at length. But that is not the crucial point; such elaboration does not occur in the printed argument circulated under his name.

What seems finally involved in the concept of "ministry to the campus" is the adequacy with which the "campus" in all its constituitive elements is apprehended. When Chamberlain, Gelwick and Porter imply that the modern university stands judged by the classical uni-versity, they ignore Dirk's insistence that the very nature of modern scholarly effort, dependent upon the various "methodologies devised in accord with what is appropriate to the subject-matter," necessitates "methodological complexity." The result is a consequent "diversity" which, although "divisive within the community of scholars," is essential to the unfolding of future truth, of future knowledge. He concludes:

> Any discussion, therefore, which attempts to enter a plea on behalf of the original 'idea' of the university must be expected to be countered with the emphasis upon variety, diversity, and pluralism. Universities exist today in deliberate recognition of such variety, diversity, and pluralism that any attempt to call them to some unified 'essense' is, at the same time, a denial of their history.[24]

If disparate methodologies actually do most fundamentally characterize the large university, fragmentation, the seeming artificiality of departmental boundaries, the vast size to which is attributed powers of "dehumanization," etc., may finally have to be acknowledged as inevitable, positive, intrinsic features of university life which permit a host of possibilities not present within the more homogeneous liberal arts environment. The question becomes one of more imaginative ways of working within this complex structure, rather than invoking a Christian judgment against it. Policy recommendation can only flow from informed opinion. Porter, when questioned about certain of the counsel in his educational analysis, finally retreated by declaring that "I think an observation here is that I would hesitate to begin writing as an educational authority." Alas, he has already done so--and rightly. A "ministry to the campus" which adopts "educational reform" as a sub-category could hardly do otherwise if the concept has any meaning. The dilemma is, again, the expertise implied in "professional" and required to translate concern for "the impact upon individual students" into workable propositions for discussion and reform which can illumine the task of those finally charged with making necessary policy decisions.

---

[24] Dirks, op. cit., p. 63.

The Ministry to the Church

Perhaps no single issue more clearly bespeaks the perplexing nature of the "trans-active" position as does the scope and specificity of such actors' responsibility and relationship to their supporting denominational churches, local and national. As we have noted above, both typological poles have resolved this dilemma: for one, identification is nearly complete; for the other, only minimal and tenuous. Deeply concerned that more adequate ministerial structures be created for working within the university, numerous tentative models have been imagined by Gelwick and Porter. Whatever the limitations, such efforts illumine a determination to be "relevant" and "concerned" and insofar as campus ministers actualize these intents, their presence and influence within the university will likely become more pronounced.

Even as they speak of university and church, however, the evidence nowhere suggests that potential affinities with denominational bodies have received equivalent thought and attention. For its part, while national church agencies publish varying materials which purport to explain and justify support of campus ministries, these, too, seem singularly lacking in relational discussion where men are identifiable in concrete situations. The "church" is imagined to be at work in the world or university but frequently the signification refers not to a social community or institution but rather a theological doctrine, a "people" who make their "way in the world." There are, consequently, few empirical referents and the movement from "faith statement" to operational situation has again been avoided. Thus the literature talks of "university people" and "townspeople" who "gain wholeness and wholesomeness by worshiping and working together in the church [local congregation] and sharing interpersonal relations."[25] But what these various words and phrases mean--their import for policy decisions and cooperative forms of action by both campus ministers and parish leadership--is not discussed; "No two situations are alike and...no simple statement of principle can cover all of them."[26]

This uncertainty and lack of clarity on the part of campus ministers and churches has been visible throughout the patterns observed in Gelwick and Porter. Still a member of the Methodist Conference, Porter's participation in its various committees was viewed by him as an imposition, while his refusal or disinclination to do so was interpreted by some clerical colleagues as favored treatment, dismissal from responsibilities which parish clergy could not easily forego or avoid. Gelwick's position at Plymouth House, intended to represent the Congregational Conference in a ministry to the California campus, did not preclude direct confrontation with local church boards over policy matters not clearly within their jurisdiction. We have seen throughout this study, beyond Johnson and Nishi, a consistent pattern of relative indifference or covert hostility to and from the parish, and campus ministers have related only minimally with their local counterparts, a point vividly illustrated by the almost total lack of meaningful communication during the crisis year.

---

[25] The Campus Ministry, p. 32.

[26] Ibid.

Local clergy have been noted attempting to by-pass the campus ministry as they considered the possible establishment of a residential college or living unit adjacent to the campus, thus tacitly refusing to recognize this ministry as possessed of insights and knowledge relevant to the matter; thus perceived by Gelwick, it was for him a professional affront. Comments by Nash reflect irritation at the lack of support from local ministers on the Campus Ministry Committee, individuals who claimed the press of more urgent matters as justification for non-attendance at regularly scheduled board sessions. Chamberlain's mild regret that more meaningful associations had not been developed with local pastors was not sufficiently compelling to motivate him in this direction. Herbert described a meeting between campus ministers and local clergymen in a neighboring city--"It wasn't very interesting"--where "the comment of the pastors of the local churches was that they thought that the campus ministry had a tendency to direct young people away from the institutional church." Echoed by two local ministers interviewed during the study, the extent of such feeling may be considerable.

These patterns of indifference and suspicion in part explain the sparsity of meaning which finally derives from the nebulous "dialogue between church and university." Cantelon's insistence--cited above--upon this "dialogue" where, in some form of direct encounter, the "best thinking" of these two social institutions will presumably offer mutual enrichment and self-understanding, is also explicit in Olds' plea that the "best minds" of university and church "must be brought to bear on the issues where religion and university meet, converse, and challenge each other."[27] Shorn of their rhetorical adornment, such language has much in common with "faith statements" observed earlier. Their translation into workable procedures by which situations are clarified and action taken is not convincingly demonstrated or even attempted. Nor do reasons seem particularly obscure or difficult to locate. The problem in such phraseology is the personification of abstracts; there is no dialogue between church and university because social institutions converse with no one. Only persons, who to be sure may speak for or on behalf of a collective or consensus, can ultimately hold conversation with one another. People who represent one institution may confer with counterparts from other institutions, but having made this statement, the level of the "dialogue" image is no longer an abstraction but speaks of instances and individuals.

To the degree that the campus minister is an interpreter of the university to the church, or an expression of the church's presence within an area considered important to its own interests, dialogue seems more hope than happening; relationships have been found almost non-existent in the trans-active and supportive categories of this study. It is difficult to avoid concluding that Porter's wish to criticize effectively the church from a relative vantage point has thus far been largely verbal and softly offered; his encounter with the Conference bishop at this point suggests the vulnerability of an outspoken position. Gelwick has recognized a variety of relationships which might be drawn between particular elements of First Congregational Church, the university and the several seminaries in Berkeley. As this study was completed, however, these remained only potential. What is implied in such circumstances seems to be, not their own lack of foresight and desire but an absence of structure and mutual understanding which might permit such expectations to occur.

---

[27] Olds, op. cit., p. 245.

Apparent in our discussion thus far is the "communication gap" between campus ministers and the local pastors that must ultimately support them. Points at which this ill-defined, largely covert condition might be spoken to, areas where both parties might mutually and beneficially talk and act in concert may easily be imagined. But effective implementation has not been discerned at California. The cause of much of this, we may speculate, lies with the local ministers. Gordon Chamberlin concludes, after study of this relational problem, that "the overwhelming testimony of men and women visited at these five campuses was that the Christian church and the modern college have little need for each other."[28] "Mission" in the churches which comprised his sample must be defined, he writes, as "evangelistic" rather than "intellectual"; "Most pastors, like their parishioners, considered the responsibility of the Christian church to higher education to be peripheral...."[29] One understands with little difficulty the least-resistant course pursued by campus ministers; they have not actively sought to counter such attitudes.

---

[28] J. Gordon Chamberlin, Churches and the Campus, p. 131.

[29] Ibid., p. 133.

This cannot, however, obviate the strategic importance they occupy vis-a-vis the churches. During the FSM crisis, both Gelwick and Porter undertook action having potential import for this question. Gelwick, we noted, sought to inform large groups within First Congregational regarding the variegated complexion of those events, and to profer their future significance. Porter's written analysis of educational problems serves, essentially, equivalent purposes. Both efforts were well-received as legitimate endeavors to offer insight and guidance regarding issues about which they might justifiably be presumed knowledgeable. What has not occurred in a systematic effort is such elucidation and education on a sustained basis. Of all the various professional ministries of the churches, these men stand closer to the subtle, intricate and extremely crucial, if less spectacular, crises which the burgeoning of knowledge within the university is increasingly precipitating on a routine basis throughout society. Yet neither man has addressed himself to carefully examining, either individually or with others, the vital import which changing social patterns and structures may have for experimentation within the corporate church as its own forms of ministry undergo change. Indeed, nothing within the Gelwick-Porter-Nash working paper suggests the need or means for identifying, analyzing and conveying to the churches this revolutionary world of knowledge which is now the university.

The campus ministry's potential mediatorial position is not confined to knowledge in the more technical or obvious sense. Given the university as the culture's principal creator and sustainer of artistic expression in all its richness and complexity, the campus religious workers are uniquely situated in the midst of aesthetic achievement. But as Professor Dirks has recently indicated in conversation, few significant appropriations of this richness have been attempted for purposes of liturgical renewal, for enrichment of the church's corporate life of worship. In sum, little evidence was found suggesting that serious consideration has been given by our trans-active actors to the singularly difficult task of concretizing in identifiable fashion the means by which their visions of institutional "dialogue" may be brought into being. We are not surprised when Gelwick admits, "I think the imperative is there, but I think what we do with it is less clear. I don't think the campus ministry has ever carried out its speeches about dialogue."

Two factors, however, may well serve to render this issue unavoidable in the future. Though hardly inevitable, we may reasonably suppose that one or both must challenge the campus ministry to more consciously consider effective means of communication, of lessening the disparity between local parish and church foundation.

1. As the "main-line" Protestant denominations continually expand the range of social concerns, both in this country and abroad, to which commitments of financial assets must be made,[30] closer scrutiny of funds allocated for many existing programs seems almost a certainty. The budget of Westminster House, for example, was trimmed two percent from 1963-64 to 1964-65, and the severity of such retrenchment could conceivably intensify. Concurrently, efforts by campus ministers to achieve greater unity or purpose and organization within the academic context could exacerbate this problem; whether all denominations now represented in the UCC will finally permit and support a cooperative, "ecumenical" organization with a corre-

---

[30] The recent promotional campaign, "Breakthrough," conducted by the Congregational Church on a national basis, is illustrative of increasing pressure for the establishment of new programs and an expansion of those now operational.

sponding de-emphasis of denominational identification remains a moot point. A corollary would seem to require that the campus ministry openly face the apparently widespread belief in the parish that university ministries tend to be disfunctional, undermining the organizational church in the minds of students. Only extensive research can determine the credibility of this belief. If true, value-judgments must then be made. The point would seem to be that ignoring the issue is unlikely to minimize its future importance. The campus ministry may finally have little choice but to devise more adequate channels for expressing and explaining the potential now emerging in the aftermath of crisis. Their ability to do so would seem crucial to the necessary recognition, support and sense of freedom that self-definition as a "professional" requires.

2. Few themes recurred with more frequency during the FSM turmoil than the following:

> Now we must begin to clarify, for ourselves, what we mean by factory. [This term is used here to describe the university.] We need to clarify this because the issues of Free Speech and the factory, of politics and education on the campus, are in danger of becoming separated. For example, the press has had the tendency to assert this separation when they insist that we return to our studies; that we are not in a center for political activity, but a center for education. Likewise, the faculty betrays the same tendency in its desire to settle the Free Speech issue as quickly and quietly as possible in order that we may return to the 'normal conduct' of our 'great university.'[31]

It is, in few words, the plea that knowledge has relevance for life. If one grants this basic premise, more effort and thought must go into finding viable ways of drawing students into meaningful situations where knowledge comes alive in human action and debate, where coherence is given inchoate bits of information and fact as it is assimilated piecemeal in the usual course structure of academic departments. It is at such points that campus ministries might well become fruitful centers for dialogue on such issues, where student capacity to make relationships between formal curricula and pressing social issues is enhanced, and perhaps more importantly, serve as focal agencies which enable such students to move into situations where these problems are being lived out. The Berkeley ministries have, as noted, addressed themselves to each of these facets but in highly uneven order. Nor is it readily discernible just how this much-discussed issue of values and their relation to action may be given the structure so disablingly absent in Herbert's ministry unless the campus ministry understands itself as more than finally campus-oriented. If the piecemeal patterns now present in nearly all denominational centers (and some, we have seen, have been effective in their reach into the community) are to be significantly improved upon, an interchange of ideas, an involvement with the inner life of the city and the church's efforts there, appear to be one precondition. Yet no campus minister in this study had more than the most tangential relationships with any aspect of religious outreach into the wider community.

---

[31] "We Want a University," mimeographed pamphlet of the Free Speech Movement, p. 5.

These problems are, of course, recognized as crucial considerations by those most immediately concerned. The tentative solutions to be offered for them, and the structures which must be devised to give them form, are not yet known. How effectively such issues are approached will obviously say much about their resolution. In any final analysis, however, the burden cannot be the campus ministers' only, but must fall much more widely. The rigidity of university administrations as they narrowly interpret a doctrine of church-state indifferently undermines and renders ineffectual conceptions of ministry which seek to take seriously social institutions; there is no certainty that the relatively open situation at Berkeley is permanent in nature. The churches, too, are intimately involved in the future of the campus ministry. At practically all levels, glaring deficiencies of understanding have been evident and even those within the denominations charged with leadership and the publication of guiding materials have often written as if talking only to one another. It seems equally obvious that additional thought and experimentation at the seminary and university levels are necessary if a body of knowledge, and procedures appropriate to its application, are to be taught those who seek to minister in this field. At least the campus ministers studied here, with the exception of Gelwick, received no formal specialized training nor do they perceive the seminary in the role of "trustee" for a given set of standards.

Will these multiple social institutions so involve themselves? If the church is to take seriously its mandate "to the world," they can hardly afford not to.

* * *

Such, then, is this study. We have observed, often in considerable detail, six men. Each has confronted a highly significant crisis in American higher education and through it, basic values and their relation to specific action has emerged with some clarity, values and action which define particular and important styles of campus ministry.

To the extent that these men are representatives of campus ministers at other large state universities, we may reasonably assume that the problems and dilemmas of self-definition will also be found elsewhere.

Is a viable conception of a relatively autonomous campus ministry possible? Yes, we have seen one articulated at some length in this study. Is its implementation probable? I do not know, of course, but I am not hopeful. The range of problems and the limited means for their solution seem, in conjunction, overwhelming. At the same time, much was learned by the campus ministry at Berkeley during the crisis, and several of our actors seemed quite undaunted by the task's enormity. Said one, "We've discovered doors open to us that have never been open before." So what now?

We shall see.

//

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aiken, Henry David. *Reason and Conduct: New Bearings in Moral Philosophy*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1962.

Aulen, Gustaf. *The Faith of the Christian Church*. Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1948.

Barton, Allan H. *The College as a Social Organization*. Monograph published by the Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1963.

Bayly, Denis. *Academic Illusion*. Greenwich: The Seabury Press, 1961.

______. *Chosen Peoples*. Philadelphia: The Christian Education Press, 1956.

Berger, Peter. *The Noise of Solemn Assemblies*. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1961.

Berelson, Bernard. *Content Analysis in Communications Research*. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1952.

Blau, Peter M., and Scott, W. Richard. *Formal Organizations*. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962.

Brown, Governor Edmund G. Excerpts from "Commencement Address," University of Santa Clara, June, 1961. Quoted in *Saturday Review*, January 16, 1965.

Bultmann, Rudolph. *Jesus and the Word*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.

Butts, R. Freeman. *The American Tradition in Religion and Education*. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1950.

California Monthly, vol. LXXV, no. 5, February, 1965.

Campus Ministry, The: The Context, History, and Practice of United Presbyterian Campus Christian Life. No author cited. Philadelphia: United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., Board of Christian Education, 1959.

Cantelon, John E. "Introduction," *A Basis for Study: A Theological Prospectus for the Campus Ministry*. Philadelphia: United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., Board of Christian Education, 1959.

______. *A Protestant Approach to the Campus Ministry*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.

Cass, James. "What Happened at Berkeley," in *Saturday Review*, January 16, 1965.

Chamberlain, Keith. "Other Views of Berkeley," in *The Christian Century*, February 3, 1965.

Chamberlin, J. Gordon. *Churches and the Campus*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963.

Constitution of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Philadelphia: Office of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1958.

Cox, Harvey. *The Secular City*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965.

"Danforth Study of Campus Ministries." Pamphlet by the Danforth Foundation, St. Louis, Mo., 1964.

Dirks, J. Edward. "Diversity in the University," *Student World*. Volume LV, no. 1, first quarter, 1962.

Draper, Hal. *Berkeley: The New Student Revolt*. New York: Grove Press, Inc. (Evergreen Books), 1965.

Eddy, Edward D. *The New Haven Register*, February 11, 1966.

Egan, E. J. *Ethics and the Campus Ministry*. Unpublished paper submitted to the Danforth Study of Campus Ministries, 1964.

Fitch, Robert L. "Extremism in the Defense of...," *The Christian Century*, January 6, 1965.

Fletcher, Joseph. *Situation Ethics*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966.

Grendon, Alexander, Peterson, William, and Jones, Hardin. "Crisis at Berkeley," *Science*, June 4, 1965.

Gross, Neal, Mason, Ward S., and McEachern, Alexander W. *Explorations in Role Analysis*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.

Gustafson, James M. *Treasure in Earthen Vessels*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1961.

Hammond, Philip. "Outline of Clergy on Campus." Mimeographed summary of forthcoming book, dated April, 1965.

Herbert, Walter T. *Experimental Program in Ministry to Graduate Students*. Unpublished report to the Glide Foundation, San Francisco, 1964.

Johnson, Harry M. *Sociology: A Systematic Introduction*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1960.

Katz, Joseph, and Sanford, Nevitt. "Causes of the Student Revolution," *Current*, no. 68, February, 1966.

Kerr, Clark. *The Uses of the University*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.

Kluckhohn, Clyde. "Values and Value-Orientations in the Theory of Action," in Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils (ed.), *Toward A General Theory of Action*. New York: Harper and Row (Torchbook edition), 1962.

Kolb, William L., and McCoy, Charles S. *The Campus Ministry in The Context of Higher Education*. Unpublished paper prepared for the Danforth Study of Campus Ministers, 1964.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. "Problems in Methodology," in *Sociology Today*. Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broam, Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., ed. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1959.

Lelyveld, Arthur J. "Interreligious Relations," in *Religion and the State University*. Erich A. Walter, ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1958.

Lenski, Gerhard. *The Religious Factor*. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1961.

Lipset, Seymour, and Seabury, Paul. "The Lesson of Berkeley," in *The Reporter*, January 28, 1965.

_______, and Wolin, Sheldon S. (ed.). *The Berkeley Student Revolt: Facts and Interpretation*. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc. (Anchor Books), 1965.

McCown, Chester C. *Man, Morals and History*. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1958.

McCoy, Charles S., and McCarter, Neely D. *The Gospel on Campus*. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959.

Merton, Robert. "Problem-Finding in Sociology," in *Sociology Today*, Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broam, Ldonard S. Cottrell, Jr., ed. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1959.

_______. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. Revised edition. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957.

Michaelson, Robert. *The Study of Religion in American Universities*. New Haven: The Society for Religion in Higher Education, 1965.

Miller, Michael V., and Gilmore, Susan (ed.). *Revolution at Berkeley*. New York: Dell Publishing Company, Inc. (Laurel Edition), 1965.

Munby, D. L. *The Idea of a Secular Society*. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Nash, Joan, Porter, William, and Gelwick, Richard. "Report to the UCC." Unpublished working paper, dated May 19, 1965, submitted to the University Church Council, Berkeley.

Niebuhr, H. Richard. Christ and Culture. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1951.

Nishi, Shunji. "Faculty and Campus Ministry," in Humanity, February, 1965.

Olds, Glenn A. "Religious Centers," in Religion and the State University, Erich A. Walter, ed. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1958.

Parsons, Talcott. Essays in Sociological Theory. Revised edition. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1954.

_______. "Pattern Variables Revisited: A Response to Robert Dubin," American Sociological Review, vol. 25, no. 4, August, 1960.

_______. The Social System. Glencoe: The Free Press (Paperback edition), 1964.

Pfeffer, Leo. Church, State, and Freedom. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1953.

Pike, James A. A Time for Christian Candor. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Raushenbush, Esther. The Student and His Studies. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1964.

Robinson, John A. T. Christian Morals Today. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.

_______. Honest to God. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Rossman, Parker. "The Denominational Chaplain in the State University," in Religious Education, vol. LV, no. 3, May-June, 1960.

_______. "Perspectives on Christian Unity: Progress and Possibilities in the American University World," in The Challenge of Christian Unity, W. B. Blakemore, ed. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1963.

Sanford, Nevitt. "Research and Policy in Higher Education," in The American College, Nevitt Sanford, ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962.

Scott, John F. "Book Reviews," in American Sociological Review, vol. 30, no. 6, December, 1965.

Shedd, Clarence P. The Church Follows Its Students. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938.

_______. "Religion in Higher Education: Retrospect and Prospect," in The Christian Scholar, vol. XXXVIII, no. 4, December, 1955.

Smith, Harry. "The Christian Faith in Higher Education," in A Basis for Study: A Theological Prospectus for the Campus Ministry. Philadelphia: The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., Board of Christian Education, 1959.

Sociology and Religion. Proceedings of the Hazen International Conference on the Sociology of Religion. Washington: Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1962.

Somers, Robert. The Mainsprings of the Rebellion: A Survey of Berkeley Students in November, 1964. Unpublished study, Department of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley.

Statement of Purpose and Structure of the University Church Council. Unpublished paper of the University Church Council, Berkeley, 1961.

Trillin, Calvin. "Letter From Berkeley," in The New Yorker, March 13, 1965.

Tussman, Joseph. The Supreme Court on Church and State. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Underwood, Kenneth. "Explanatory Notes on the Survey Instrument and Data in the Danforth Study of Campus Ministries." Unpublished memorandum, Danforth Study of Campus Ministries, 1966.

______. Protestant and Catholic. Boston: Beacon Press, 1957.

______. "The University as Moral Critic of American Business," in College and Chapel, Spring, 1964.

Vogt, Evan Z., and O'Dea, Thomas F. "A Comparative Study of the Role of Values in Social Action in Two Southwestern Communities," in American Sociological Review, vol. 18, no. 6, December, 1953.

Weiss, Paul. "Science in the University," Daedalus, vol. 93, no. 4, Fall, 1964.

"We Want a University." Mimeographed pamphlet of the Free Speech Movement. Berkeley: University of California (n.d.).

Williams, Colin W. What in the World. New York: National Council of Churches in the United States of America, 1965.

Winter, Gibson. The Suburban Captivity of the Churches. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1961.

Wolin, Sheldon S., and Schaar, John H. "A Special Supplement: Berkeley and the Fate of the Multiversity," in The New York Review of Books, March 11, 1965.

Yinger, Milton J. Religion, Society and the Individual. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1957.